9/

REPORT RESUMES

ED 002 791 24

A STUDY OF THE STRUCTURE OF ATTITUDES OF PARENTS OF EDUCABLE MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN AND A STUDY OF A CHANGE IN ATTITUDE STRUCTURE, VOLUME 1.

BY- FLIEGLER, LOUIS A. HEBELER, JEAN

SYRACUSE UNIV., N.Y., RESEARCH INSTITUTE

REPORT NUMBER CRP-018-VOL. 1 PUB DATE 60

CONTRACT OEC-SAE-6408

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.90 HC-$23.52 588P.

DESCRIPTORS- *MENTAL RETARDATION, *RETARDED CHILDREN, *EDUCABLE MENTALLY HANDICAPPED, *PARENT ATTITUDES, COUNSELING PROGRAMS, *PERSONALITY CHANGE, SYRACUSE, NEW YORK

ASSESSMENT OF ATTITUDES OF PARENTS OF EDUCABLE MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF ALTERING PARENTAL ATTITUDES THROUGH TIME SEQUENCES OF COUNSELING WERE MADE. THE PROJECT STUDIED 60 FATHERS AND 60 MOTHERS WHO WERE DIVIDED INTO 4 GROUPS, EACH GROUP CONSISTING OF 15 FATHERS AND 15 MOTHERS. ONE GROUP SERVED AS THE CONTROL GROUP, ONE GROUP RECEIVED INTENSIVE COUNSELING FOR 1 WEEK, ONE GROUP PARTICIPATED IN COUNSELING ONCE A MONTH FOR A 3-MONTH PERIOD, AND ONE GROUP PARTICIPATED IN COUNSELING FOR A 6-MONTH PERIOD. THE ATTITUDES OF PARENTS INVOLVED IN THE STUDY WERE MEASURED BY ATTITUDE TESTS, INTERVIEWS, AND PERSONALITY TESTS. TESTS WERE ADMINISTERED TO EACH PARENT BEFORE AND AFTER GROUP SESSIONS IN ORDER TO DETERMINE CHANGES IN ATTITUDE. (JL)

ED002791

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

A STUDY OF THE STRUCTURE OF ATTITUDES OF PARENTS OF EDUCABLE MENTALLY RETARDED CHILDREN AND A STUDY OF A CHANGE IN ATTITUDE STRUCTURE

Volume I

Louis A. Fliegler, Ph.D.
Jean Hebeler, Ed.D.

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to Contract SAE-6408
United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education
and Welfare, Washington 25, D. C. and Syracuse University,
William M. Cruickshank, Ph.D., Project Director
1960

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The magnitude of this research project indicates that many people had a hand in its completion. Primary gratitude must first be expressed to the parents of retarded children who participated wholeheartedly in this investigation. Rather than naming any specific individuals, suffice it to say that the parents in Binghamton, New York City, Rochester, Schenectady, and Syracuse, New York deserve special commendation for their voluntary efforts and unreserved belief in the intent of the research.

In addition, many people at Syracuse University contributed unstintingly of their time and effort. Prominent among these individuals are Babette Davis, Muriel Lutzy, Peg Trippe, Jean Wilkins, Ray Wolf, and Ronald Verrillo. Without them, the interviewing, counseling, and laborious clerical work would not have been possible. Statistical assistance and support was given by Dr. Eric Gardner, Sid Archer, and Robert McMorris. The machine processing of the data was performed by Dr. Werner Rheinboldt and Richard Wilkins. Hidden behind any research group is the guiding hand of a secretary. In this case, we were most fortunate in having three secretaries who expedited many of the necessary tasks - Louise Dillon, Ruth Frey, and June Nasiff.

Last but not least, special appreciation is extended to the U. S. Office of Education, Cooperative Research Program, for their encouragement and financial assistance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii

LIST OF TABLES vii

Chapter I. INTRODUCTION 1

A. General Statement of the Problem 3

B. Definition of Terms 3

C. Hypothesis and Questions 5

D. Limitations of the Study 7

Chapter II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE 9

A. General 9

B. Attitude Measurement 14

C. Attitudes Toward Mental Retardation 18

D. Counseling Parents 27

Chapter III. EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE 33

A. Population Characteristics 33

B. Description of Instruments and Techniques . . 39

1. Interview 39

2. Parental Attitudes Research Instrument . . 42

3. Attitude Scale Toward Mental Retardation . 49

4. Gradient Sentence Completion Test 52

5. Stern Activities Index 61

C. Procedure 64

1. Administration of Instruments 64

2. Counseling Format and Procedure 65

3. Statistical Analyses 69

Page

Chapter IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 71

Question 1. What is the attitude structure of parents who have educable mentally handicapped children? 71

Question 2. What is the pattern of familial adjustment of parents of educable mentally handicapped children? 85

Question 3. Is there significant variability within the total population on any of the instruments used? 88

Question 4. What is the effect of counseling upon the attitudes and need personality structure of parents who have educable mentally handicapped children? 123

Question 5. What is the influence of the length of the counseling period upon the attitudes and need structure of parents of the educable mentally handicapped at each testing period: (a) immediately following termination of counseling, and (b) after a 6 - 9 months' time interval?. . . 171

Question 6. What is the effect of a "Concentrated" versus a "Distributed" counseling period upon the attitudes and need personality structure of parents of educable mentally handicapped children? 256

Question 7. What are the differences in attitudes and need personality structure between mothers and fathers of educable mentally handicapped children? 306

Question 8. What differences in attitudes and need personality structure exist between the experimental groups and the Control group? 400

Question 9. What differences exist in attitudes and need personality structure between parents in a group who complete counseling and those who drop out in less than three counseling periods (Experimental versus Clinic Dropout)? 441

Page

Question 10. What differences exist in attitudes and need personality structure between parents who take an initial test but do not enter counseling (Attrition) and those who continue in counseling (Experimental)? 472

Question 11. What differences exist in attitudes and need personality structure between a group who ~~are~~ is interviewed but does not enter counseling (Contact) and those who consummate their counseling sessions (Experimental)? 502

Question 12. What differences exist in parents of educable mentally handicapped children between general attitudes toward child-rearing practices and specific attitudes relevant to retardation? 505

Chapter V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 540

Bibliography 549

Appendices - Volume II

A. Instruments

1. Data Sheet Format a1

2. Interview Outline a4

3. Parental Attitude Research Instrument - Inventory of Attitudes on Family Life and Children - Father a5

4. Parental Attitude Research Instrument - Inventory of Attitudes on Family Life and Children - Mother a21

5. Attitude Scale Toward Mental Retardation a30

6. Gradient Sentence Completion Test - Father a46

7. Gradient Sentence Completion Test - Mother a59

Page

B. Clinical Reports

1. Sample Interview a72

2. Excerpts from Notes on Counseling Sessions a87

C. Tables

1. Question 3 - Analysis of variance: Is there significant variability within the total population on any of the instruments used? a101

2. Question 4 - Analysis of variance: What is the effect of counseling upon the attitudes and need personality structure of parents who have mentally handicapped children? a178

3. Question 5 - Analysis of variance: What is the influence of the length of the counseling period upon the attitudes and need structure of parents of the educable mentally handicapped at each testing period: (a) immediately following termination of counseling, and (b) after a 6-9 months' time interval? a400

LIST OF TABLES

Table No. Page No.

1 Study Population for All Treatment Groups 34

2 Chronological Age Range of the Study Population 35

3 Education of the Study Population 37

4 Age and Sex of the Retarded Child of the Parents In the Study Population 38

5 Counseling and Test Administration of Study Population 68

9 Distribution of PARI Scores for the Entire Study Population at Initial Testing 72

10 Distribution of PARI Scores for the Entire Father Study Population at Initial Testing 73

11 Distribution of PARI Scores for the Entire Mother Study Population at Initial Testing 76

12 Distribution of AMR Scores for the Entire Study Population at Initial Testing 78

13 Distribution of AMR Scores for the Entire Father Study Population on Initial Testing 80

14 Distribution of AMR Scores for the Entire Mother Study Population on Initial Testing 82

15 Distribution of DRQ Scores for the Entire Study Population on Initial Testing 85

16 Distribution of DRQ Scores for the Entire Father Study Population on Initial Testing 86

17 Distribution of DRQ Scores for the Entire Mother Study Population on Initial Testing 87

Initial Significant Differences on DRQ Scores for the Entire Study Population (N = 85)

18 Category 2 Neighborhood 89

Initial Significant Differences on DRQ Scores for the Entire Father Study Population (N = 35)

19 Category 1 Intra-Family 90

20 Category 3 Activity-Goals 90

21 Category 5 Parental Relationships 91

Table No. Page No.

Initial Significant Differences on PARI Scores for the Entire Study Population (Total Group N = 85)

22 Category 1 Encouraging Verbalization 92
23 Category 10 Suppression of Aggression 93
24 Category 11 Equalitarianism 93
25 Category 14 Suppression of Sexuality 93
26 Category 16 Comradeship and Sharing 94
27 Category 17 Expression of Affection 94
28 Category 18 Autonomy of the Child 94

Initial Significant Differences on PARI Scores for the Entire Study Population (Fathers N = 35)

29 Category 1 Encouraging Verbalization 95
30 Category 7 Irritability 96
31 Category 12 Avoidance of Communication 96
32 Category 14 Suppression of Sexuality 96
33 Category 16 Comradeship and Sharing 97
34 Category 20 Harsh Punishment 97
35 Category 24 Irresponsibility of Father 97
36 Category 26 Complaint of Ascendancy of Wife 98

Initial Significant Differences on PARI Scores for the Entire Study Population (Mothers N = 50)

37 Category 6 Strictness 99
38 Category 9 Deification of Parent 99
39 Category 11 Equalitarianism 99
40 Category 19 Achievement 100

Initial Significant Differences on AMR Scores for the Entire Study Population (Total Group N = 85)

41 Category 6 Independency 101
42 Category 9 Peer Interaction 101

Initial Significant Differences on AMR Scores for the Entire Study Population (Fathers N = 35)

43 Category 5 Dependency 102
44 Category 6 Independency 102
45 Category 9 Peer Interaction 103
46 Category 17 Expression of Affection 103
47 Category 18 Suppression of Sex 103
48 Category 20 Excluding Outside Influences 104
49 Category 21 Avoidance of Communication 104

Initial Significant Differences on AMR Scores for the Entire Study Population (Mothers N = 50)

50 Category 23 Deification 105
51 Category 25 Strictness. 105
52 Category 33 Achievement 105

Table No. Page No.

Initial Significant Differences on GSC Variable Scores for the Entire Study Population (Total Group N = 85)

53 Category 2 Achievement 107
54 Category 4 Acquisition 107
55 Category 19 Nurturance 107
56 Category 21 Optimism 108
57 Category 31 Submissiveness 108

Initial Significant Differences on GSC Variable Scores for the Entire Study Population (Fathers N = 35)

58 Category 4 Acquisition 109
59 Category 27 Rejection 109
60 Category 28 Seclusion 110
61 Category 34 Understanding 110

Initial Significant Differences on GSC Variable Scores for the Entire Study Population (Mothers N = 50)

62 Category 2 Achievement 111
63 Category 5 Affiliation 111
64 Category 7 Autonomy 112
65 Category 10 Counteraction 112
66 Category 12 Description 112
67 Category 14 Identification 113
68 Category 22 Order. 113
69 Category 31 Submissiveness 113

Initial Significant Differences on SAI Scores for the Entire Study Population (Total Group N = 85)

70 Category 7 Adaptiveness 115
71 Category 10 Order 116
72 Category 11 Harmavoidance 116
73 Category 15 Reflectiveness 116
74 Category 19 Affiliation 117
75 Category 20 Nurturance. 117

Initial Significant Differences on SAI Scores for the Entire Study Population (Fathers N = 35)

76 Category 5 Energy 118
77 Category 10 Order 118
78 Category 12 Understanding 119
79 Category 17 Scientism 119
80 Category 19 Affiliation 119
81 Category 34 Rejection 120
82 Category 35 Autonomy 120

Table No. Page No.

Initial Significant Differences on SAI Scores for the Entire Study Population (Mothers N = 50)

83 Category 13 Counteraction 121
84 Category 14 Achievement 121
85 Category 16 Humanism 122
86 Category 27 Ego Achievement 122

Significant Differences over the Three Test Administrations for the Cazenovia Group for the AMR (N = 12)

87 Category 3 Appearance 124
88 Category 14 Educational Implications and Treatment . 124
89 Category 24 Comradeship and Sharing 124

Significant Differences over the Three Test Administrations for the Cazenovia Group on the AMR (Mothers N =6)

90 Category 14 Educational Implications and Treatment. 125
91 Category 24 Comradeship and Sharing 126
92 Category 28 Autonomy of Child 126

Significant Differences over the Three Test Administrations for the Cazenovia on the GSC Variables (Total N = 12)

93 Category 3 Acquiescence 127
94 Category 11 Deference 128
95 Category 17 Irritability 128

Significant Differences over the Three Test Administrations for the Cazenovia Group on the GSC Variables (Fathers N = 6)

96 Category 3 Acquiescence 129
97 Category 17 Irritability 129
98 Category 24 Phobia 129
99 Category 34 Understanding 129

Significant Differences over the Three Test Administrations for the Cazenovia Group on the GSC Variables (Mothers N = 6)

100 Category 6 Aggression. 130
101 Category 7 Autonomy 130

Significant Differences over the Three Test Administrations for the Cazenovia Group on the SAI (Total Group (N = 12)

102 Category 6 Pragmatism 131
103 Category 24 Dominance 132

Table No. Page No.

Significant Differences over the Three Test Administrations for the Minnowbrook Group on the PARI (N = 21)

104 Category 14 Suppression of Sexuality 133

Significant Differences over the Three Test Administrations for the Minnowbrook Group on the PARI (Fathers N=7)

105 Category 14 Suppression of Sexuality 134

Significant Differences over the Three Test Administrations for the Minnowbrook Group on the PARI (Mothers N=14)

106 Category 14 Suppression of Sexuality 134

Significant Differences over the Three Test Administrations for the Minnowbrook Group on the AMR (Total N=21)

107 Category 1 Sexuality 135
108 Category 12 Comprehension of Self and Others . . . 136
109 Category 14 Educational Implications and Treatment 136
110 Category 15 Community Provision 136
111 Category 16 Emotional-Social Behavior 137
112 Category 18 Suppression of Sexuality 137

Significant Differences over the Three Test Administrations for the Minnowbrook Group on the AMR (Fathers N=7)

113 Category 15 Community Provision 138
114 Category 16 Emotional-Social Behavior 138
115 Category 18 Suppression of Sex 138
116 Category 24 Comradeship and Sharing 139

Significant Differences over the Three Test Administrations for the Minnowbrook Group on the AMR (Mothers N=14)

117 Category 14 Educational Implications and Treatment 139
118 Category 18 Suppression of Sex 140
119 Category 24 Comradeship and Sharing 140

Significant Differences over the Three Test Administrations for the Minnowbrook Group on the GSC Variables (Total N = 21)

120 Category 3 Acquiescence 141
121 Category 4 Acquisition 141
122 Category 21 Optimism 142

Significant Differences over the Three Test Administrations for the Minnowbrook Group on the GSC Variables (Fathers N = 7)

123 Category 4 Acquisition 142
124 Category 21 Optimism 143

Table No. Page No.

Significant Differences Over the Three Test Administrations for the Minnowbrook Group on the GSC Variables (Mothers N = 14)

125 Category 4 Acquisition 143
126 Category 11 Deference 144
127 Category 21 Optimism 144
128 Category 32 Succorance 144

Significant Differences over the Three Test Administrations for the Twice A Month Group on the PARI (Fathers N-4)

129 Category 22 Non-Punishment 146

Significant Differences over the Three Test Administrations for the Twice A Month Group on the AMR (Total N=11)

130 Category 17 Expression of Affection 147

Significant Differences over the Three Test Administrations for the Twice A Month Group on the AMR (Fathers N = 4)

131 Category 17 Expression of Affection 147

Significant Differences over the Three Test Administrations for the Twice A Month Group on the GSC Variables (Total N = 11)

132 Category 2 Achievement 148
133 Category 7 Autonomy 148
134 Category 14 Identification 148
135 Category 25 Play 149
136 Category 31 Submissiveness 149

Significant Differences over the Three Test Administrations for the Twice A Month Group on the GSC Variables (Fathers N = 4)

137 Category 2 Achievement 150
138 Category 14 Identification 150

Significant Differences over the Three Test Administrations for the Twice A Month Group on the GSC Variables (Mothers N = 7)

139 Category 12 Description 151
140 Category 18 Narcissism 151
141 Category 25 Play 151
142 Category 31 Submissiveness 152
143 Category 33 Supernaturalism 152

Significant Differences over the Three Test Administrations for the Twice A Month Group on the SAI (Fathers N = 4)

144 Category 4 Play 153

Table No. Page No.

Significant Differences over the Three Test Administrations for the Twice A Month Group on the SAI (Mothers N = 7)

145 Category 7 Adaptiveness 154

Significant Differences over the Three Test Administrations for the Once A Month Group on the PARI (Total Group N = 8)

146 Category 1 Encouraging Verbalization 155
147 Category 5 Marital Conflict 156
148 Category 6 Strictness 156
149 Category 11 Equalitarianism 156
150 Category 16 Comradeship and Sharing 157
151 Category 17 Expression of Affection 157
152 Category 18 Autonomy of Child 157
153 Category 19 Achievement 158

Significant Differences over the Three Test Administrations for the Once A Month Group on the PARI (Mothers N = 4)

154 Category 1 Encouraging Verbalization 159
155 Category 5 Achievement 159

Significant Differences over the Three Test Administrations for the Once A Month Group on the AMR (Fathers (N = 4)

156 Category 12 Comprehension of Self/and Others . . . 160

Significant Differences over the Three Test Administrations for the Once A Month Group on the AMR (Mothers N = 4)

157 Category 19 Encouraging Verbalization 160

Significant Differences over the Three Test Administrations for the Once A Month Group on the GSC Variables (Total N = 8)

158 Category 8 Avoidance 161
159 Category 31 Submissiveness 162

Significant Differences over the Three Test Administrations for the Once A Month Group on the GSC Variables (Fathers N = 4)

160 Category 6 Aggression 162
161 Category 8 Avoidance 163

Significant Differences over the Three Test Administrations for the Once A Month Group on the SAI (Mothers N = 4)

162 Category 3 Change 164
163 Category 32 Sameness 164

Table No. Page No.

Significant Differences over the Two Test Administrations for the Control Group on the PARI (Mothers N = 8)

164 Category 7 Irritability 166
165 Category 18 Autonomy of Child 166

Significant Differences over the Two Test Administrations for the Control Group on the AMR (Total N = 15)

166 Category 2 Genetic Responsibility 167
167 Category 21 Avoidance of Communication 167

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of DRQ Scores for the Experimental Group for the First Testing Period (N = 52)

168 Category 3 Activity Goals 172

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of DRQ Scores of the Experimental Group for the First Testing Period (Fathers N = 21)

169 Category 2 Neighborhood 172

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of PARI Scores of the Experimental Group for the First Testing Period (N = 52)

170 Category 1 Encouraging Verbalization 173
171 Category 11 Equalitarianism 174
172 Category 16 Comradeship and Sharing 174
173 Category 17 Expression of Affection 174
174 Category 18 Autonomy of Child 175

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of PARI Scores of the Experimental Group for the First Testing Period (Fathers N = 21)

175 Category 1 Encouraging Verbalization 176
176 Category 7 Irritability 176
177 Category 11 Equalitarianism 176
178 Category 15 Ascendancy 177
179 Category 18 Autonomy of Child 177

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of PARI Scores of the Experimental Group for the First Testing Period (Mothers N = 31)

180 Category 1 Encouraging Verbalization 178
181 Category 5 Marital Conflict 178
182 Category 7 Irritability 178
183 Category 11 Equalitarianism 179
184 Category 16 Comradeship and Sharing 179
185 Category 17 Expression of Affection 179
186 Category 18 Autonomy of Child 180

Table No. Page No.

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of PARI Scores of the Experimental Group for the Second Testing Period (N = 52)

187 Category 1 Encouraging Verbalization 181
188 Category 11 Equalitarianism 181
189 Category 18 Autonomy of Child 181

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of PARI Scores of the Experimental Group for the Second Testing Period (Fathers N = 21)

190 Category 5 Marital Conflict 182
191 Category 7 Irritability 183
192 Category 15 Ascendancy 183
193 Category 18 Autonomy of Child 183

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of PARI Scores of the Experimental Group for the Second Testing Period (Mothers N = 31)

194 Category 11 Equalitarianism 184

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of PARI Scores of the Experimental Group for the Third Testing Period (N = 52)

195 Category 6 Strictness. 185

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of PARI Scores of the Experimental Group for the Third Testing Period (Fathers N = 21)

196 Category 5 Marital Conflict 186
197 Category 13 Inconsiderateness 186
198 Category 20 Harsh Punishment 187
199 Category 24 Irresponsibility of Father 187

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of AMR Scores of the Experimental Group for the First Testing Period (N = 52)

200 Category 1 Sexuality 189
201 Category 9 Peer Interaction 189
202 Category 12 Comprehension of Self/and Others . . . 189
203 Category 14 Educational Implications and Training . 190
204 Category 16 Emotional-Social Behavior 190

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of AMR Scores for the Experimental Group for the First Testing Period (Fathers N = 21)

205 Category 1 Sexuality 191
206 Category 9 Peer Interaction 191
207 Category 19 Encouraging Verbalization 191

Table No. Page No.

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of AMR Scores for the Experimental Group for the First Testing Period (Mothers N = 31)

208 Category 5 Dependency 192
209 Category 7 Aggression 193
210 Category 16 Emotional-Social Behavior 193
211 Category 28 Autonomy of Child 193
212 Category 33 Achievement 194

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of AMR Scores for the Experimental Group for the Second Testing Period (N = 52)

213 Category 1 Sexuality 195
214 Category 3 Appearance 195
215 Category 4 Normalcy of Development 196
216 Category 5 Dependency 196
217 Category 6 Independency 196
218 Category 9 Peer Interaction 197
219 Category 29 Equalitarianism 197

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of AMR Scores for the Experimental Group for the Second Testing Period (Mothers N = 31)

220 Category 1 Sexuality 198
221 Category 5 Dependency 199
222 Category 15 Community Provision 199
223 Category 29 Equalitarianism 199

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of AMR Scores for the Experimental Group for the Third Testing Period (N = 52)

224 Category 9 Peer Interaction 200
225 Category 23 Deification 200

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of AMR Scores for the Experimental Group for the Third Testing Period (Fathers N = 21)

226 Category 3 Appearance 201
227 Category 9 Peer Interaction 202
228 Category 12 Comprehension of Self and Others . . 202

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of AMR Scores for the Experimental Group for the Third Testing Period (Mothers N = 31)

229 Category 16 Emotional-Social Behavior 203

Table No. Page No.

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of GSC Variable Scores for the Experimental Group for the First Testing Period (N = 52)

230 Category 13 Dominance 205
231 Category 15 Integrity 205
232 Category 17 Irritability 205
233 Category 19 Nurturance 206

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of GSC Variable Scores of the Experimental Group for the First Testing Period (Fathers N = 21)

234 Category 11 Deference 207
235 Category 12 Description 207

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of GSC Variable Scores for the Experimental Group for the First Testing Period (Mothers N = 31)

236 Category 13 Dominance 208
237 Category 16 Intellectualism 208
238 Category 17 Irritability 209
239 Category 31 Submissiveness 209

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of GSC Variable Scores for the Experimental Group for the Second Testing Period (N = 52)

240 Category 2 Achievement 210
241 Category 3 Acquiescence 210
242 Category 4 Acquisition 210
243 Category 8 Avoidance 211
244 Category 9 Benignness 211
245 Category 22 Order 211
246 Category 25 Play 212
247 Category 31 Submissiveness 212

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of GSC Variable Scores for the Experimental Group for the Second Testing Period (Fathers N = 21)

248 Category 1 Abasement 213
249 Category 4 Acquisition 213
250 Category 9 Benignness 214
251 Category 22 Order 214

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of GSC Variable Scores for the Experimental Group for the Second Testing Period (Mothers N = 31)

252 Category 23 Pessimism 215
253 Category 33 Supernaturalism 215

Table No. Page No.

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of GSC Variable Scores for the Experimental Group for the Third Testing Period (N = 52)

254 Category 3 Acquiescence 217
255 Category 10 Counteraction 217
256 Category 14 Identification 217
257 Category 15 Integrity 218
258 Category 16 Intellectualism 218
259 Category 17 Irritability 218
260 Category 22 Order 219
261 Category 31 Submissiveness 219
262 Category 34 Understanding 219

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of GSC Variable Scores for the Experimental Group for the Third Testing Period (Fathers N = 21)

263 Category 1 Abasement 221
264 Category 4 Acquisition 221
265 Category 9 Benignness 221
266 Category 14 Identification 222
267 Category 15 Integrity 222
268 Category 21 Optimism 222
269 Category 22 Order 223
270 Category 34 Understanding 223

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of GSC Variable Scores for the Experimental Group for the Third Testing Period (Mothers N = 31)

271 Category 3 Acquiescence 224
272 Category 17 Irritability 225
273 Category 28 Seclusion 225
274 Category 31 Submissiveness 225
275 Category 33 Supernaturalism 226
276 Category 34 Understanding 226

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of GSC Direction Scores of the Experimental Group for the Third Testing Period (Mothers N = 31)

277 Category 1 Positive 228

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of SAI Scores of the Experimental Group for the First Testing Period (N = 52)

278 Category 10 Order 229
279 Category 11 Harmavoidance 229
280 Category 15 Reflectiveness 229
281 Category 19 Affiliation 230
282 Category 20 Nurturance 230

Table No. Page No.

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of SAI Scores of the Experimental Group for the First Testing Period (Fathers N = 21)

283 Category 5 Energy 231
284 Category 10 Order 231
285 Category 11 Harmavoidance 231
286 Category 12 Understanding 232
287 Category 17 Scientism 232
288 Category 19 Affiliation 232
289 Category 25 Narcissism 233
290 Category 35 Autonomy 233

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of SAI Scores of the Experimental Group for the First Testing Period (Mothers N = 31)

291 Category 10 Order 234
292 Category 13 Counteraction 234
293 Category 15 Reflectiveness 235
294 Category 18 Objectivity 235

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of SAI Scores of the Experimental Group for the Second Testing Period (N = 52)

295 Category 10 Order 236
296 Category 11 Harmavoidance 237
297 Category 19 Affiliation 237
298 Category 20 Nurturance 237
299 Category 22 Conjunctivity 238
300 Category 34 Rejection 238
301 Category 36 Disjunctivity 238

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of SAI Scores of the Experimental Group for the Second Testing Period (Fathers N = 21)

302 Category 10 Order 239
303 Category 11 Harmavoidance 240
304 Category 12 Understanding 240
305 Category 17 Scientism 240
306 Category 19 Affiliation 241
307 Category 20 Nurturance 241
308 Category 21 Succorance 241
309 Category 25 Narcissism 242
310 Category 29 Impulsion 242
311 Category 34 Rejection 242
312 Category 35 Autonomy 243
313 Category 39 Deliberation 243

Table No. Page No.

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of SAI Scores of the Experimental Group for the Second Testing Period (Mothers N = 31)

314 Category 8 Abasement 244
315 Category 19 Affiliation 244
316 Category 34 Rejection 245

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of SAI Scores of the Experimental Group for the Third Testing Period (N = 52)

317 Category 10 Order 246
318 Category 19 Affiliation 246
319 Category 21 Succorance 246
320 Category 35 Autonomy 247

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of SAI Scores of the Experimental Group for the Third Testing Period (N = 21)

321 Category 10 Order 248
322 Category 11 Harmavoidance 249
323 Category 12 Understanding 249
324 Category 17 Scientism 249
325 Category 19 Affiliation 250
326 Category 23 Aggression 250
327 Category 24 Dominance 250
328 Category 26 Fantasied Achievement 251
329 Category 27 Ego Achievement 251
330 Category 34 Rejection 251
331 Category 37 Blameavoidance 252

Significant Differences on Analysis of Variance of SAI Scores of the Experimental Group for the Third Testing Period (Mothers N = 31)

332 Category 19 Affiliation 253
333 Category 34 Rejection 253

334 Comparison Between the Concentrated and the Distributed Clinic Group, Mothers and Fathers on DRQ Scores . . . 257

335 Comparison of the Concentrated and the Distributed Clinic Group on PARI Scores 258

336 Comparison of the Concentrated and the Distributed Clinic Group Fathers on PARI Scores 262

337 Comparison of the Concentrated and the Distributed Clinic Group Mothers on PARI Scores 265

Table No.		Page No.
338	Comparison Between the Concentrated and the Distributed Clinic Group on AMR Scores	268
339	Comparison Between the Concentrated and the Distributed Clinic Group Fathers on AMR Scores . . .	273
340	Comparison Between the Concentrated and the Distributed Clinic Group Mothers on AMR Scores . . .	276
341	Comparison Between the Concentrated and the Distributed Clinic Group on GSC Variable Scores . .	281
342	Comparison Between the Concentrated and the Distributed Clinic Group Fathers on GSC Variable Scores	284
343	Comparison Between the Concentrated and the Distributed Clinic Group Mothers on GSC Variable Scores	288
344	Comparison Between the Concentrated and the Distributed Clinic Group on GSC Direction Scores . .	292
345	Comparison Between the Concentrated and the Distributed Clinic Group Fathers on GSC Direction Scores	293
346	Comparison Between the Concentrated and the Distributed Clinic Group Mothers on GSC Direction Scores	294
347	Comparison Between the Concentrated and the Distributed Clinic Group on SAI Scores	294
348	Comparison Between the Concentrated and the Distributed Clinic Group Fathers on SAI Scores . . .	298
349	Comparison Between the Concentrated and the Distributed Clinic Group Mothers on SAI Scores . . .	302
350	Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Cazenovia Group on DRQ Scores	306
351	Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Cazenovia Group on PARI Scores	307
352	Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Cazenovia Group on AMR Scores	310

Table No. Page No.

353 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Cazenovia Group on GSC Variable Scores 313

354 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Cazenovia Group on GSC Direction Scores 316

355 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Cazenovia Group on SAI Scores 317

356 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Minnowbrook Group on DRQ Scores 320

357 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Minnowbrook Group on PARI Scores 321

358 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Minnowbrook Group on AMR Scores 324

359 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Minnowbrook Group on GSC Variable Scores 328

360 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Minnowbrook Group on GSC Direction Scores 331

361 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Minnowbrook Group on SAI Scores 333

362 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Twice A Month Group on DRQ Scores 337

363 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Twice A Month Group on PARI Scores 338

364 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Twice A Month Group on AMR Scores 340

365 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Twice A Month Group on GSC Variable Scores 343

366 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Twice A Month Group on GSC Direction Scores 347

367 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Twice A Month Group on Stern Scores 348

Table No. Page No.

368 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Once A Month Group on DRQ Scores 353

369 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Once A Month Group on PARI Scores 354

370 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Once A Month Group on AMR Scores 356

371 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Once A Month Group on GSC Variable Scores 360

372 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Once A Month Group on GSC Direction Scores 362

373 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Once A Month Group on SAI Scores 363

374 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Control Group on DRQ Scores 367

375 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Control Group on PARI Scores 368

376 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Control Group on AMR Scores 370

377 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Control Group on GSC Variable Scores 372

378 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Control Group on GSC Direction Scores 374

379 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Control Group on SAI Scores 375

380 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Clinic Dropout Group on DRQ Scores 378

381 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Clinic Dropout Group on PARI Scores 379

382 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Clinic Dropout Group on AMR Scores 380

383 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Clinic Dropout Group on GSC Variable Scores 382

384 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Clinic Dropout Group on GSC Direction Scores 385

385 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Clinic Dropout Group on SAI Scores 386

Table No. Page No.

386 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Attrition Group on DRQ Scores 388

387 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Attrition Group on PARI Scores 389

388 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the attrition Group on AMR Scores 391

389 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Attrition Group on GSC Variable Scores 393

390 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Attrition Group on GSC Direction Scores 395

391 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Attrition Group on SAI Scores 396

392 Comparison Between Mothers and Fathers in the Contact Group on DRQ Scores 398

393 Comparison Between the Control and the Combined Clinic Group on DRQ Scores 400

394 Comparison Between the Control and the Combined Clinic Group Fathers on DRQ Scores 401

395 Comparison Between the Control and the Combined Clinic Group Mothers on DRQ Scores 402

396 Comparison Between the Control and the Combined Clinic Group on PARI Scores 403

397 Comparison Between the Control and the Combined Clinic Group Fathers on PARI Scores 405

398 Comparison Between the Control and the Combined Clinic Group Mothers on PARI Scores 408

399 Comparison Between the Control and the Combined Clinic Group on AMR Scores 411

400 Comparison Between the Control and the Combined Clinic Group Fathers on AMR Scores 414

401 Comparison Between the Control and the Combined Clinic Group Mothers on AMR Scores 417

402 Comparison Between the Control and the Combined Clinic Group on GSC Variable Scores 420

Table No. Page No.

403 Comparison Between the Control and the Combined Clinic Group Fathers on GSC Variable Scores 423

404 Comparison Between the Control and the Combined Clinic Group Mothers on GSC Variable Scores 425

405 Comparison Between the Control and the Combined Clinic Group on GSC Direction Scores 428

406 Comparison Between the Control and the Combined Clinic Group Fathers on GSC Direction Scores 429

407 Comparison Between the Control and the Combined Clinic Group Mothers on GSC Direction Scores 430

408 Comparison Between the Control and the Combined Clinic Group on SAI Scores 431

409 Comparison Between the Control and the Combined Clinic Group Fathers on SAI Scores 434

410 Comparison Between the Control and the Combined Clinic Group Mothers on SAI Scores 437

411 Comparison Between the Clinic Dropout and the Combined Clinic Group on DRQ Scores 441

412 Comparison Between the Clinic Dropout and the Combined Clinic Group Fathers on DRQ Scores 442

413 Comparison Between the Clinic Dropout and the Combined Clinic Group Mothers on DRQ Scores 443

414 Comparison Between the Clinic Dropout and the Combined Clinic Group on PARI Scores 444

415 Comparison Between the Clinic Dropout and the Combined Clinic Group Fathers on PARI Scores 445

416 Comparison Between the Clinic Dropout and the Combined Clinic Group Mothers on PARI Scores 447

417 Comparison Between the Clinic Dropout and the Combined Clinic Group on AMR Scores 450

418 Comparison Between the Clinic Dropout and the Combined Group Fathers on AMR Scores 452

419 Comparison Between the Clinic Dropout and the Combined Group Mothers on AMR Scores 454

Table No. Page No.

420 Comparison Between the Clinic Dropout and the Combined Clinic Group on GSC Variable Scores 456

421 Comparison Between the Clinic Dropout and the Combined Clinic Group Fathers on GSC Variable Scores . 458

422 Comparison Between the Clinic Dropout and the Combined Clinic Group Mothers on GSC Variable Scores . 460

423 Comparison Between the Clinic Dropout and the Combined Clinic Group on GSC Direction Scores 462

424 Comparison Between the Clinic Dropout and the Combined Clinic Group Fathers on GSC Direction Scores. 463

425 Comparison Between the Clinic Dropout and the Combined Clinic Group Mothers on GSC Direction Scores. 463

426 Comparison Between the Clinic Dropout and the Combined Clinic Group on SAI Scores 464

427 Comparison Between the Clinic Dropout and the Combined Clinic Group Fathers on SAI Scores 467

428 Comparison Between the Clinic Dropout and the Combined Clinic Group Mothers on SAI Scores 469

429 Comparison Between the Attrition and the Combined Clinic Group on DRQ Scores 472

430 Comparison Between the Attrition and the Combined Clinic Group Fathers on DRQ Scores 473

431 Comparison Between the Attrition and the Combined Clinic Group Mothers on DRQ Scores 474

432 Comparison Between the Attrition and the Combined Clinic Group on PARI Scores 474

433 Comparison Between the Attrition and the Combined Clinic Group Fathers on PARI Scores 476

434 Comparison Between the Attrition and the Combined Clinic Group Mothers on PARI Scores 477

435 Comparison Between the Attrition and the Combined Clinic Group on AMR Scores 479

436 Comparison Between the Attrition and the Combined Clinic Group Fathers on AMR Scores 481

Table No. Page No.

437 Comparison Between the Attrition and the Combined Clinic Group Mothers on AMR Scores 484

438 Comparison Between the Attrition and the Combined Clinic Group on GSC Variable Scores 486

439 Comparison Between the Attrition and the Combined Clinic Group Fathers on GSC Variable Scores . 488

440 Comparison Between the Attrition and the Combined Clinic Group Mothers on GSC Variable Scores . 490

441 Comparison Between the Attrition and the Combined Clinic Group on GSC Direction Scores 492

442 Comparison Between the Attrition and the Combined Clinic Group Fathers on GSC Direction Scores. 493

443 Comparison Between the Attrition and the Combined Clinic Group Mothers on GSC Direction Scores. 493

444 Comparison Between the Attrition and the Combined Clinic Group on SAI Scores 494

445 Comparison Between the Attrition and the Combined Clinic Group Fathers on SAI Scores 497

446 Comparison Between the Attrition and the Combined Clinic Group Mothers on SAI Scores 499

447 Comparison Between the Contact and the Combined Clinic Group on DRQ Scores 502

448 Comparison Between the Contact and the Combined Clinic Group Fathers on DRQ Scores 503

449 Comparison Between the Contact and the Combined Clinic Group Mothers on DRQ Scores 504

450 Comparison Between Parallel Categories on the PARI and AMR Scores for the Cazenovia Group 506

451 Comparison Between Parallel Categories on the PARI and AMR Scores for the Cazenovia Group Fathers 508

452 Comparison Between Parallel Categories on the PARI and AMR Scores for the Cazenovia Group Mothers 510

453 Comparison Between Parallel Categories on the PARI and AMR Scores for the Minnowbrook Group 513

Table No. Page No.

454 Comparison Between Parallel Categories on the PARI and AMR Scores for the Minnowbrook Group Fathers . . . 515

455 Comparison Between Parallel Categories on the PARI and AMR Scores for the Minnowbrook Group Mothers . . . 517

456 Comparison Between Parallel Categories on the PARI and AMR Scores for the Twice A Month Group 519

457 Comparison Between Parallel Categories on the PARI and AMR Scores for the Twice A Month Group Fathers . . 521

458 Comparison Between Parallel Categories on the PARI and AMR Scores for the Twice A Month Group Mothers . . 522

459 Comparison Between Parallel Categories on the PARI and AMR Scores for the Once A Month Group 525

460 Comparison Between Parallel Categories on the PARI and AMR Scores for the Once A Month Group Fathers . . 526

461 Comparison Between Parallel Categories on the PARI and AMR Scores for the Once A Month Group Mothers . . 528

462 Comparison Between Parallel Categories on the PARI and AMR Scores for the Control Group 530

463 Comparison of Fathers on Parallel Categories of the PARI and AMR Scores for the Control Group . . . 532

464 Comparison Between Parallel Categories on the PARI and AMR Scores for the Control Group Mothers 533

465 Comparison Between Parallel Categories on the PARI and AMR Scores for the Clinic Dropout Group 535

466 Comparison Between Parallel Categories on the PARI and AMR Scores for the Clinic Dropout Group Fathers. . 536

467 Comparison Between Parallel Categories on the PARI and AMR Scores for the Clinic Dropout Group Mothers. . 537

468 Comparison Between Parallel Categories on PARI and AMR Scores for the Attrition Group 538

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The apparent interest in the problems of mental retardation is a vital social phenomenon of the past decade. Basically, the rise of parent groups and the increase of community interest on a local and national level obviously represents a change in attitudes toward mental retardation. Parenthetically, this shift would have an impact upon the family in its intra and inter-relationships. It can be assumed that the social perception of a community toward mental retardation is to some degree reflected in the way in which the parents of a mentally retarded child view retardation.

The study of general and specific attitude structure has been a matter of increasing interest in the study of human behavior. This trend seems to be concomitant with the expansion of education and counseling programs at all levels. While some material in the literature has been concerned with attitude formation in the general population, there is a sparsity of methodological work relevant to the impact of specific problem areas, such as retardation, upon the individual and the family.

The diverse patterns of variables and their influence upon parental attitudes and need structure represent a critical area for investigation. Such information is essential to enhance positive adjustment between parent and child. The factors which have been related to the expressed attitude pattern are the severity of the retardation, the age of the child, the presence of accompanying secondary disabilities, the socio-economic status of the parent, his social attitude toward retardation and adjustment problems, parental educational level, self-adjustment and need pattern, as well as the influence of previous experiences in regard to retardation. If, as a number of writers maintain, the formation of attitudes depends upon a complex of specific and unique factors for each individual, the investigation of a few of these factors relevant to the formation of parental attitudes toward their retarded child seems pertinent.

For this investigation, socio-economic level is considered a basic variable of significance in determining parental attitudes. It is conceivable that the middle socio-economic level parent who has an educable mentally handicapped youngster may experience greater problems in adjustment than the low socio-economic level parent. First, the devaluation of status in the community is a threat to the ego. Second, the apparent closeness of the child to normalcy encourages doubt and anxieties. The parent, in order to maintain his status, may increase the pressures in the family constellation. A great deal of emphasis is placed upon the intellect as a motivating force for achievement and role status. It is assumed by the parent that the birth of a defective progeny summarily results in a low order status position in the hierarchy of prominence in this culture. Whether such a conclusion is warranted matters little to the parent since he tends to form his own value judgments and to develop individualistic attitudes toward retardation.

An investigation of the parental attitude structure toward retardation may provide insights into familial behavior patterns which have implications for the social sciences. The information gained will be essential for the understanding and subsequent guidance of parent-child, parent-school, child-school and community relationships. Consequently, such a study has significance in the total habilitation process of the retardate as well as for the entire familial adjustment.

I. A. General Statement of the Problem

The present study was intended as an investigation into the structure of both the general and specific attitudes and need personality patterns of parents of educable mentally handicapped children. Further, it attempted to determine the effect of selected counseling procedures upon this structure and the sustained effect over a period of time.

I. B. Definition of Terms

Educable Mentally Handicapped refers to children with I.Q.'s ranging between 50 and 75 which were achieved on an individual psychological examination.

An Attitude Structure pertains to the pattern of the conceptual responses elicited on the various measures, i.e., Parental Attitude Research Instrument which assesses general attitudes toward child-rearing practices, and Attitude Scale Toward Mental Retardation which measures specific attitudes that refer directly to the condition of retardation.

Need Personality Structure relates to the pattern of characteristic behaviors which influence an individual's psychological interactions in his life space. Information in this investigation which deals with these variables was elicited primarily from data on the Stern Activities Index and the Gradient Sentence Completion Test.

Cazenovia Group. This counseling group met for a concentrated period of time of one weekend at Cazenovia, New York.

Minnowbrook Group. This counseling group met for the period of time of one week while being accommodated at the Syracuse University Lodge at Minnowbrook.

Twice a Month Group. This counseling treatment group is comprised of individuals who met twice monthly in evening sessions over a period of three months.

Once a Month Group. This counseling treatment group is comprised of individuals who met for one evening session each month over a period of six months.

Clinic Dropout Group. This group is comprised of participants who completed Test I and attended no more than two counseling sessions.

Attrition Group. This group is comprised of subjects who completed Test I but did not attend any counseling sessions.

Contact Group. This group is comprised of individuals who expressed initial interest in participating in the project and were subsequently interviewed but were unable to or did not participate in any of the testing or counseling sessions.

Control Group. This group is comprised of individuals who were used as test controls. They received no counseling in the interim, but were administered the interview, Test I and Test II after a time lapse of 6 months.

The Concentrated Clinic Group is composed of the subjects in the Cazenovia and Minnowbrook groups who received their counseling over a short time interval.

The Distributed Clinic Group is composed of the subjects in the Twice a Month and Once a Month groups who received their counseling over a more extended time interval.

The Combined Clinic Group refers to the four groups who completed the full counseling and testing schedule (Cazenovia, Minnowbrook, Twice a Month, and Once a Month). This group will also be referred to as the Experimental Group.

I. C. Hypothesis and Questions

It is hypothesized that counseling over a short or extended time span will affect the attitudes and need personality structure of parents of educable mentally handicapped children.

Although a number of sub-hypotheses emerge from the major hypothesis, it seems pertinent to state them in question form since the analysis of the data is made by categories rather than the total instrument.

The purposes of the study are concerned with the following questions:

1. What is the attitude structure of parents who have educable mentally handicapped children?
2. What is the pattern of familial adjustment of parents of educable mentally handicapped children?
3. Is there significant initial variability within the total population on any of the instruments used?

4. What is the effect of counseling upon the attitudes and need personality structure of parents who have mentally handicapped children?

5. What is the influence of the length of the counseling period upon the attitudes and need personality structure of parents of the educable mentally handicapped at each testing period: (a) immediately following termination of counseling and (b) after a 6-9 months time interval?

6. What is the effect of a "Concentrated" versus a "Distributed" counseling period upon the attitudes and need personality structure of parents of educable mentally handicapped children?

7. What are the significant differences in attitudes and need personality structure between fathers and mothers of educable mentally handicapped children?

8. What differences in attitudes and need personality structure exist between the experimental groups and the Control groups?

9. What differences exist in attitudes and need personality structure between parents in a group who complete counseling and those who drop out in two or less counseling periods (Experimental vs. Clinic Dropout)?

10. What differences exist in attitudes and need personality structure between parents who take an initial test but do not enter counseling (Attrition) and those who continue in counseling (Experimental)?

11. What differences exist in attitudes and need personality structure between a group who are interviewed but do not enter counseling (Contact) and those who consummate their counseling sessions (Experimental)?

12. What differences exist in parents of educable mentally handicapped children between general attitudes toward child-rearing practices and specific attitudes relevant to retardation?

I. D. Limitations of the Study

A number of aspects with relevance to the problem have not been explored in the present investigation because of limitations of the data and the nature of the problem. The delimiting factors are primarily based upon the availability of subjects within the established criteria. Briefly these factors are:

1. The selective method used in the choice of the population sample.
2. The broad chronological age range of the children represented by the parent sample.
3. The uneven sex distribution of the children represented by the parent sample.
4. The geographical distribution centered in areas where special education programs exist.

Certain decisions regarding the focus of the project affecting the procedure and analysis of the data need to be noted:

1. The description and analysis of attitude and need patterns were based on the analysis of the individual's status and change during the time span of the project and did not attempt to differentiate between this and any other counseling or therapeutic experiences of the individual.
2. The primary focus in the analysis of counseling effect was placed upon both direction of and degree of change rather than the personal adjustment of the parent *per se*.
3. As the measuring instruments were administered at certain prescribed time intervals according to the design, there is understandably no intra-check on the effect of and the dynamics of counseling during the interim period.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

II. A. General

Attitude description and measurement has long been a topic of concern and controversy by theorists and practitioners in the field. A prerequisite for any consideration of this nature is a delineation of the facets comprising the general concepts of an attitude or attitude pattern. Inherent in this task of evolving an inclusive definition, as well as subsequent descriptions of specific attitude patterns, is the dispute over the generality versus the specificity of attitudes.

Green (28), in his discussion, referred to the concept of an attitude as a consistency of abstraction from a large number of related acts or responses rather than any specific act or response of an individual. As such, it is a latent variable acting as an intervening or mediating force between the stimuli and response and is used to refer to the consistency or covariation of a number of responses to stimuli of a similar nature. In this context manifest variables constitute responses to specific situations. A sample of these manifest variables is used to measure the attitude. The set of social objects comprising the reference class of an attitude differentiates between attitudes and other psychological variables such as intelligence, habit, drive or temperament. Thus from this point of view the operational description of an attitude is always based upon the stimuli and response areas constituting it. Krech and Crutchfield (39) defined an attitude as "an enduring organization of motivational, emotional, perceptual and cognitive processes with respect to some aspect of the individual's world." This description implies a certain consistency of response patterns.

They noted that attitudes provide an individual with stability for adjusting his behavior set for new experiences and that basic attitudes do not change with each incompatible fact experienced. Doob (20) attached the additional criteria of social significance within the individual's societal milieu to his description. He also pointed out that an attitudinal response can be both anticipatory and mediating in its function. In a similar context, Allport (2) stressed that attitudes are both mental and neural states of readiness for directive influence upon the individual's responses. Smith _et_ _al_.(69), in commenting on the complex of variables, pointed out that attitude formation and expression are influenced by the need of the individual to simultaneously cope with the demands of conscience, impulse and reality. They noted that a change in a basic need may bring about or cause the need for a series of related and dependent attitudes. Allport (2) cited four major sources of attitude formation:

(1) the integration of specific responses
(2) the result of approach or withdrawal tendencies
(3) a single dramatic experience
(4) transference from another individual.

English and English (22) presented the following composite definition of an attitude as that which expresses the concepts most commonly referred to in current usage and research and is representative of those already cited:

> ". . . an enduring, learned predisposition to behave in a consistent way toward a given class of objects; a persistent mental and/or neural state of readiness to react to a certain object or class of objects, not as they are but as they are

> conceived to be. It is by the consistency of response to a class of objects that an attitude is identified."

Guttman (30) placed special emphasis upon the latter point and stressed that an operational definition of an attitude must always be considered in terms of the referent class of stimuli.

A clear and separate delineation of attitude determiners is often difficult because of the extreme variation among attitude definitions or descriptions in terms of both content and degree of specificity. Rohde (56) related the formation of attitudes to Murray's needs theory. She indicated that the frequency and intensity of each of the three components of personality formation: the need patterns, motives or inner states (e.g. conflicts, dejection, optimism), and the press of the environmental factors affect the attitude pattern of an individual. Allport (2) cited four major sources or bases for specific attitudes:

(1) integration of specific responses
(2) general approach or withdrawal tendencies
(3) a single dramatic experience
(4) incorporation from others.

He cited four ways in which attitudes are developed:

(1) integration of experiences through accumulation in a certain direction over a period of time
(2) differentiation of a specific attitude from a more general one
(3) shock due to an unusual, violent or painful experience
(4) adoption from family, acquaintances, or communication media.

A major concomitant in the consideration of attitude definition, description, and determination is the level of generality or specificity at which the behavior is observed, conceptualized, and related to a theoretical framework. Remmers (52) noted that the specificity or generality of attitudes depends upon their breadth as indicated in their clustering in society, their degree of absorption by the individual and the nature of the attitude in question. He suggested that the generality or specificity of attitudes may be considered as a function of:

> "(1) the degree to which attitude objects or attitudes themselves are organized into sets of related clusters by society in which an individual lives;
>
> (2) the degree to which an individual has absorbed the structure or organization of the society in which he lives, which in turn is the function of his age, maturity, and sensitivity to social forces; and
>
> (3) the narrowness with which an attitude is defined; broader, more inclusive attitudes being more likely to be independent, self-contained, and 'specific' than attitudes more narrowly conceived."

In his discussion of the major determiners of attitudes, previously noted, Allport (2) also alluded to this distinction. Krech and Crutchfield (39) related the specificity and generality of established attitudes to their alteration. They maintained that individual differences operate in the determination of the amount and/or level of information necessary for a shift in attitude. This change may become part of the generalized pattern or may be applicable only in an isolated situation depending upon the individual and the quality of the information. Similarly, Smith, et al. (69) noted that a change in one dominant attitude may affect others subservient to it and that changes in the basic need pattern of the individual may be underlying such behavior. Hartshorne and May (32), in their well known investigations of honesty and deceit, supported the specificity and relative isolation of certain attitude structures. They found that an individual could be honest in one situation but dishonest in a very similar one, indicating a lack of generality in at least some contexts. On the other hand, the predominant generality of attitudes was favored by Cantril (14) when he indicated that a shift in any dominant force brings about an alteration of the basic need pattern and thus can affect the entire attitudinal structure. This assumption is somewhat similar to the theoretical explanation of Krech and Crutchfield (39), although it does not allow for the influence of individual differences. Obviously, the dynamics and direction of specific and generalized attitude formation are not yet fully understood.

As a further aspect of the question of the generality-specificity and the determiners of attitudes, a differentiation between real and expressed attitudes warrants mention. Several investigators differentiated between real and expressed attitudes as they are manifested in observable behavior of some form (i.e. statement, projective, direct observation). General consensus seems to be that in most attempts at attitude measurement, expressed rather than real attitudes are being sampled since it is extremely difficult to reliably obtain "true" expressions of attitude by any of the methods currently employed. Different types of measures and situations can understandably achieve different levels of closeness to the real attitude. Observation of behavior has been indicated by some as more reliable than some of the more opinionnaire-like methods. Brody (12) found that the discrepancy between what an individual indicates about his attitudes and the actual behavior is often great. Rohde (55), for this reason, favored the projective sentence completion form, and Schaefer and Bell (62) attempted to structure their items and format so as to minimize stereotyped responses. Whether differences in expressed and real attitudes as measured by the various scales exist at the varying levels of stimulus content specificity (relating to children and child-rearing practices in general versus specific reference to a retardate) will be an important consideration of this study.

II. B. Attitude Measurement

Pioneer attempts to measure attitudes were initiated by Cattell with his work on social values and extended by Thurstone (80, 81), and Thurstone and Chave (79). As previously noted, it was recognized by these and subsequent investigators that a discrepancy exists between an attitude which is inferred from a measure, the symbolized or expressed attitude, and the real attitude.

Conceiving of an attitude as a predisposition to motivation and response to stimuli in a certain fashion, Smith et al. (69) cited two general approaches to attitude investigation related to their schema: (1) description and measurement and (2) discovering determinants or correlates of particular attitudes. More specifically related to concrete methodology, Shoben (68) cited three major approaches to the assessment of parental attitudes: direct observation, rating scales, and inventory-type questionnaires. Tendler (76) proposed use of projective measurement in this area in 1930. Rohde (55) provided further stimulation in this approach. She stressed the utilization of a wide range of stimuli so as to tap a greater number of personality phases and the maintenance of as little control as possible by the stimuli on the responses. Since she compared the response pattern to that of Murray's (46) needs theory, she also organized the quantitative interpretation according to personality variables based on the Murray schema. In commenting on the comparison of responses on a sentence completion projective measure and interview information, Symonds (75) concluded that the sentence completion test often elicits unconscious third person projections of basic trends in the form of wishes, hostilities, loves, fears, impulses and motives in general, as well as some first person response trends in areas in which the subject is able and willing to admit.

The first attempt to measure attitudes of parents by a self-inventory method was made by Laws (40) with a 4-part questionnaire administered to fifty mothers. Unfortunately, no data on reliability or validity were obtained for her instrument and results were inconclusive. Stogdill (72) constructed a 60-item instrument utilizing degree of agreement and disagreement as response modes to items relating to children's behavior. Descriptive data from parents, students, and dental hygienists were obtained. The U.S.C. Parent Attitude Survey is another form of self-inventory developed for the elicitation of attitudes toward children and their behavior by Shoben (68). This instrument has become a theoretical and methodological model for many subsequent attempts at attitude scale construction.

In addition to the type of measuring instrument and criteria used for the elicitation of various attitude responses, Stein (70) cited a number of variables which contribute to the significance of the interpretation of the responses made to any of the modes of approach:

(1) frequency of recurrence of a theme or pattern of response
(2) speed of reaction to stimuli

(3) length of the completed response
(4) accompanying behavior prior to, during, and after administration
(5) erasures
(6) omissions
(7) intensity of language used.

In this same context, Rotter and Willerman (59) concluded that their findings using an incomplete sentences test with different populations dispelled the hypothesis that omissions or humorous or flippant responses indicated a severe conflict area. They interpreted such response behavior as correlated with good adjustment in the majority of their subjects responding in that fashion. They felt such behavior was similar to the individual's saying, "My feelings are none of your business." Bell and Schaefer (7, 63) tended to agree with Stein (70) on the basis of their theoretical bases and experience and suggested that the subject omitting or refusing a response has deep emotional (realized or unrealized) reasons for doing so. Rohde (55) also felt that attempts at deception and false or cryptic responses were as revealing clinically as the full free response. The criteria for construction of items for attitude measures was discussed quite extensively by Bell (5, 6). He suggested that in order to diminish the effect of a tendency toward conformance to socially acceptable norms, items should be stated in opposition to current theories rather than in the affirmative position or the use of statements of fact. He further noted that items with disguised statements in regard to content response such as the method employed in projective items have generally been found to be more effective discriminators on the basis of corroborative criteria. Sacks (60), in developing his sentence completion test, similarly hypothesized that the subject reveals more about himself when his attention is directed away from himself to other people or impersonal objects. In this manner the subject is not put on the defensive, does not feel the need to control his response, and thereby often reveals latent needs and attitudes which he would otherwise be either unwilling or unable to recognize or express. Stein (70) also supported this point and added the variable of time pressure in the increase of reliability. He theorized that the pressure to respond quickly and move on to further items or activities would prevent the respondent from reconsidering and censoring his initial response to the stimulus because of social awareness.

Among the investigators who developed attitude scales relevant to general child-rearing practices to parents are Bell and Schaefer (5, 62, 64, 65, 66) - the Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI), Shoben (68) - the University of Southern California Attitude Survey, and Block (8) - the Child-Rearing Attitude Scale. Block demonstrated on fathers, who were in the military service, that measured attitudes toward child-rearing were related to fairly stable personality characteristics. Those fathers who expressed restrictive attitudes were seen by observers as overcontrolling their own needs and external circumstances, dependent and repressing, and subject to feelings of inadequacy. On the other hand, those fathers who expressed more permissive viewpoints were more assured, confident, stable but not rigid, and capable of supporting their opinions.

The utilization of attitude scales already developed or of especially constructed forms for use in relationship to exceptional children has been recent and sparse. Haring, _et al_. (31) attempted to measure and alter attitude patterns of teachers toward all types of exceptionality. For the most part, they utilized scales already developed for other purposes. Zuckerman et al. (85, 86, 87, 88), as well as a number of other investigators (1, 18, 41, 48), have recently employed the PARI within the framework of groups concerned with various areas of exceptionality in order to obtain descriptive and differentiating data. Both Mark (42) and Shoben (68) have utilized their scales with parents of disturbed children.

Few instruments have been constructed which specifically relate to exceptionality or any area of it. Boles (10) recently constructed a scale for use with mothers of cerebral palsied children which attempts to elicit information concerning the maternal concept of the child as well as her own concerns and feelings. Also quite recently, Thurston (77, 78) developed the Thurston Sentence Completion Form (TSCF) for use with parents of severely handicapped children. To date use of this instrument has been reported on a group of parents of 372 institutional cerebral palsied patients. Information gained from this utilization has been primarily related to dynamics and functions of parental counseling.

Contemporarily, no instrument specifically devoted to the measurement of attitudes relevant-to retardation had been developed. Also no definitive study had been reported which attempted to systematically measure the attitudes of parents or any other group toward retardation per se; nor has this been attempted according to a pre- and post-counseling test schema.

II. C. Attitudes Toward Mental Retardation

Greenberg (29) pointed out that parents have certain needs which can be met only by their children--the satisfaction of parenthood and an opportunity to provide security, aid, and education for them. When a handicapped child is born, some parental needs will go unmet because of the child's limitations in profitting from the parental resources. A further frustration for the parent is the social tendency toward smaller families. The parent must devote his resources and expectations to fewer offspring. The presence of a handicapped child in a small family increases the measure of unfulfillment for the parent in contrast to that in a larger family with a greater number of siblings. Merrill (44) discussed the effect of increased motivation on the consistency of maternal behavior. Generally a mother's relationship with her child seems to be influenced and altered by a motivation to have the child appear in the best possible light. She noted that when this motivation was restricted in any way the mother was apt to assume more direct control and to carry on less interactive behavior with the child.

According to Baldwin et al. (3), there are two primary factors necessary for the formulation of a general description of parent-child relationships: (1) the emotional attitude of the parent toward the child and (2) the parent's intellectual philosophy of child care. The individual characteristics of the child - appearance, behavior, and developmental rate - are all important determinants in the parental reaction. It is assumed by the authors indicated that consideration and analysis of these variables should provide insight into underlying parental attitudes toward any child.

Handicapping Conditions:

Greenberg (29) identified a number of reactions to the existence of a handicapped child on the part of parents depending upon their needs and background: disappointment, shame and/or guilt, a loss of pride in independence brought about by the need to utilize services of an outside agency, an intellectual challenge for ideas and techniques in coping with the problem, and frustration at the additional responsibility and restriction of themselves and their financial resources. Coughlin (17) hypothesized that any differences noted in the expressed attitudes of parents of handicapped individuals are the result of stress of the disability bringing out already present deep seated feelings and adjustment patterns which might not have otherwise reached the level of conscious expression. This point of view was also stressed by Gordon and Ullman (25) when they described the varying levels of parental awareness and readiness.

Retardation:

The bulk of the material appearing in the literature referring specifically to attitudes of parents of retarded children has been derived from observation and case study approaches rather than systematic research. Material of a theoretical and descriptive nature is most prevalent. The greater part of the material reported here has been derived from work with parents of severely retarded children. In some cases, the particular functional level of the children was not specified. Rankin (51), on the basis of observations of the behavior of eleven mothers in a series of 20 group counseling sessions in a child guidance clinic, suggested that the difficulty which parents experience in dealing with the retardation problem stems essentially from two areas: (1) the internal psychic conflicts reactivated or reinforced by the retardation and (2) an inability of knowing what procedures to follow in the care and treatment of the child. While noting the influence of personality patterns, educational and cultural background, financial and social status on attitude formation, Murray (47) cited six major problem areas for the parent of a retarded child:

(1) acceptance of the condition of retardation

(2) financial

(3) emotional tension in a situation in which the burden is not shared with the general population

(4) theological conflicts

(5) the need for a solution to the problem of lifetime care, and most important,

(6) the need for constructive professional counseling at various periods of the child's life in order to assist the parents in resolving their own questions and problems.

Stone (73) attempted to isloate certain causative factors related to varying patterns and acceptance levels. She noted the effect of:

(1) psychic pain

(2) identification with the child to the extent that the parent feels that part of himself is defective and/or being punished

(3) marital problems wherein blame is being transferred from one mate to the other and the child remains as the symbol of punishment

(4) social non-acceptance whereby the parent feels apart from relatives, neighbors, and other individuals because of the existence of the retardate

(5) the competitive nature of our society in that it constantly compares individuals in regard to behavior and achievement on the basis of chronological age norms.

In commenting on some of the precipitating factors for certain attitude and behavior patterns of parents of the retarded, Richards (53) suggested that perhaps the greatest handicap of mental retardation is not the condition itself but the lack of public understanding. Kelman (37) concurred on this point.

Kanner (35) differentiated between three primary reaction types in parents of the retarded:

(1) those who acknowledge the condition as an actuality, accept the child as he is and follow their usual routine
(2) those who disguise the reality of the condition and may attempt to ascribe the handicap to a correctible condition
(3) those with so complete an inability to face reality that they deny the existence of the condition.

From her perusal of the clinical and interview reports on 11 cases with I.Q's below 75, Grebler (27) presented a similar breakdown of parental reaction which she related to the theoretical framework of Symonds (74) and Rosenzweig (58):

(1) rejection in which blame may be placed on others or some factors in the environment
(2) ambivalence characterized by guilt and self-condemnation and frequently expressed by over-protection, over-indulgence
(3) acceptance in the form of a conciliatory reaction to the condition.

Stone (73) studied the interview reports in the case records of a child guidance clinic both at the beginning and end of a series of diagnostic interviews and found that she could classify in a similar schema as

Grebler (27), the degree of awareness of retardation expressed by the parents:

(1) considerable--in which the individual states the presence of the condition, recognizes its associated limitations and seeks suitable care and training
(2) partial--where the individual questions his maintenance of hope for improvement or "cure" and also questions his own ability to cope with the problem
(3) minimal--wherein the individual refuses to accept the condition as being abnormal, names other possible reasons for the behavior and expresses the hope that treatment will produce a "normal child".

Parental reactions to retardation in 67 children, all under the age of 1, as reported by Graliker et al. (26), were divided into two classification groups:

(1) subjective--those primarily parent-centered and relating to their feelings concerning the retardate (e.g. causation questions, statements of rejection, embarrassment, worry about reactions of relatives, friends)
(2) objective--those primarily related with reality factors concerning the retarded child (e.g. accompanying physical disabilities, the child's future, accuracy of diagnosis, institutionalization and schooling facilities)

It is interesting to note the similarity of classification of reactions by these investigators all using somewhat different approaches to obtain their information as well as to derive their rationale for interpretation.

Several of the references approached the consideration of parental reaction to retardation from some variation of the acceptance-rejection dichotomy. Gallagher (24) provided an excellent discussion to this point in which he pointed out the incongruity of expecting complete acceptance on the part of parents for a child who is unable to fulfill their expectations, and consequently represents a disappointment to them. A more interpretative approach taking into account all aspects of an individual's experiences was suggested as a more realistic and valid approach to the dynamics of attitude formation and expression. In this same context, Zuk (89) and Blodgett (9) stressed the need for extreme caution in the interpretation of observed parental behavior. They pointed out the fine points of discrimination to be considered. For example, an "accepting" parent may seek information in order to provide assistance whereas a "rejecting" parent might similarly seek information for the purpose of allaying his own guilt feelings. It cannot be assumed that the overt reaction necessarily expresses the true parental reaction. In an attempt to further delineate the dynamics of attitude formation of maternal concepts toward retardation, Rosen (57) related the steps of attitude formation to Dewey's "Steps in Thinking" and identified five major phases:

(1) awareness of a problem
(2) recognition of a problem
(3) seeking a cause or justification
(4) seeking a solution - cure or relief - either physical or psychological
(5) acceptance of the situation.

As indicated previously, Rosen and others have pointed out that this final stage, acceptance of a handicapping situation, can never be complete.

While most writers have dealt solely with the effect of the retardation upon the attitudes and adjustment of the parents, both Heilman (33) and Grebler (27) noted the impact of the converse--the effect of the parents' attitude upon the handicapped child. They indicated that there is a direct relationship between the child's attitude toward himself and his handicap, and the attitude of the parent. Grebler (27) brought focus upon an additional inherent complication. While the parents' behavior toward and about the retarded child is magnified, the retarded child as the recipient and instrument of such behavior is more poorly equipped than the average to understand and cope with the parental reactions. This set of circumstances understandably operates in a cyclical fashion in its impact upon both parent and retardate. Kelman (36) attributed some of the more extreme reaction and conflict on the part of parents of the retarded to the societal value system. He pointed out that there is generally less social acceptance for retardation than any other handicapping condition. In addition, there is the predominant tendency to equate social worth and intellectual ability. As the child grows older and the developmental lag more noticeable, this concept often becomes the cause of increased tension for the parent, child and family constellation. Heilman (33) pinpointed one of the manifestations of this when she noted that in the case of a dual handicap involving retardation and a physical or emotional disability, the parent is very likely to "accept" one condition and not the other. Retardation, in these cases, is frequently viewed as less acceptable and thus denied or suppressed.

One of the few completed studies contrasting the adjustment of parents to different kinds of handicapping conditions is that of Klebanoff (38) with mothers of schizophrenic, brain injured and retarded, and normal children. He administered the PARI to all three groups and found significant differences on some variables between the mothers of the normals and the brain injured retarded, and the mothers of the normals and the schizophrenics. His results on this second comparison are somewhat similar to differences found by Shoben (68) between mothers of problem and non-problem children and to findings of Mark (42) with mothers of schizophrenics. However, on the comparison of the two groups (mothers of schizophrenics vs. brain injured retarded), Klebanoff (38) found no significant differences. His findings on the first two comparisons lend support to some aspects of the theory of the generality-specificity of attitude structure. Nelson (48) also administered the PARI to 212 mothers of exceptional children of varying diagnostic categories. She found some significant differences on three factors within the sub-populations. Mothers of children diagnosed as neurologically impaired, familially retarded, motor and/or visually handicapped scored high on the authoritarian scales. Mothers of the emotionally disturbed, reading disability cases and "normal" children exhibited high scores while mothers of the neurologically impaired and speech and/or hearing handicapped scored low. Low democratic attitudes were expressed by mothers of the speech and/or hearing cases and the familially retarded whereas the mothers of the motor and/or visually impaired and reading disability cases were high on that factor. Fredericks (23) contrasted the attitudes of mothers of 40 mentally handicapped, 40 orthopedically handicapped and 40 non-handicapped children as measured by the University of Southern California Parent Attitude Survey. Significant differences between the two handicapped groups was found only on the Dominance sub-scale with the mothers of the retarded scoring higher. Neither exceptional group was significantly different from the normals on the variables measured by the scale.

While it has been pointed out that the existing material relevant to attitudes toward retardation has been sparse and essentially of a theoretical and secondary descriptive nature, these presentations provide an excellent theoretical and beginning frame-work upon which to develop specific research designs.

II. D. Counseling Parents

Since one of the major facets of the current study is the investigation of the effects of counseling upon parental attitudes, a brief review of pertinent material in this area seems appropriate. Ohlsen et al. (49) defined counseling, in the broad sense, as any contacts in which a trained counselor attempts to assist, in a non-medical setting, either an individual or a small group toward achieving better adjustment. This essentially describes the counseling concept employed by the current investigators.

As was noted in the preceding section, one of the problem areas expressed by parents of the retarded seemed to be the need for adequate and appropriate counseling services at various stages. Burgess (13) similarly interpreted initial reactions of parents of handicapped children to a counseling situation as being an expression of need, on their part, in an area where they had been unable to cope with their problems alone.

Levels of readiness and ability to cope with more basic problems as the result of counseling have been noted by a number of investigators.

These patterns understandably seem to correspond with the stages of development of understanding and "acceptance" noted by those investigators who dealt with parents of the retarded in clinical settings. For example, when he traced the evolution of the topic foci in his counseling sessions with parents of the retarded, Sheimo (67) noted that initial concern was not directed toward the condition per se but to the causative factors and concrete ways of obtaining aid. This he interpreted as an attempt to alleviate or relieve self-blame and guilt. He suggested that what parents really want from these sessions is relief of anxiety and support in making their own decisions in regard to the child. He contended that the parents know the diagnosis but often dwell on it because of anxiety and conflict in dealing with their more personal feelings. Morris (45) pointed out that this approach assists the parent in achieving understanding and in experiencing satisfaction as a parent. Similarly, Jensen (34) considered the management of emotional ties as the core of the problem of adjustment to a retarded child. As a result, he saw the prime task of counseling as one of assisting parents in defining their problems and securing possible solutions.

In respect to specific modes of counseling treatment for various purposes, Weingold and Hormuth (83) noted the positive effect of bringing parents together in a group counseling situation because the group provided understanding support and a climate for the release of repressed feelings. As evidence of this, they presented topics which had been brought out by the parents in the sessions. The areas included expressions of lack of confidence in handling the retardates, fear in giving them responsibility, concern over sexual adjustment, and vocational goals. With the passage of time and the cohesiveness of the relationship between the group members, the level of the topics of discussion developed in areas of more personal and deep concern. Coleman (16) similarly found that the topics brought up in his group counseling sessions with parents of the retarded developed from an overt intellectual level to personal, specific and socially oriented ones as familiarity and within-group ease increased. Major problems highlighted in these discussion sessions focused on:

(1) acceptance of themselves as parents of the retarded and a diminution of guilt feelings
(2) viewing their child realistically
(3) adjusting their level of aspiration for their retarded child
(4) avoidance of overprotecting the child and thereby inhibiting his development
(5) problems with normal siblings
(6) sexual problems of the retardate
(7) the institutionalization question
(8) future provision for the retardate
(9) parental assistance to the retardate at home
(10) school programs

In commenting on the reactions of parents of retarded children within their first year, Graliker _et al_. (26) noted similar patterns and found that any initial attempts at planning for or assisting the parent in planning for the future were impossible as they were so preoccupied with their reactions to the diagnosis of retardation. At this time also, referrals to parent groups were largely ignored - perhaps since such affiliation might indicate acceptance of the retardation diagnosis by the parent before he was ready. From these experiences, the authors stressed that initial attention in counseling be paid to the diagnosis, etiology and immediate problems for individual and joint parental adjustment before future considerations are brought up. In conjunction with their five year study of the reactions of parents to retardation, Gordon and Ullman (25) conducted an eight week series of group sessions with parents of mongoloid children under the age of five. Of the ten parents who enrolled, six had regular attendance while the other four were sporadic. The most predominant concerns seemed to be related to acceptance of the child and his integration into the family unit. The attitudes of the individual parents ranged greatly. Here, as was pointed out in a preceding section, the personal adjustment of the parent prior to the superimposition of the retardation and its problems seemed to be a crucial concomitant. Begab (4) combined the major factors evident in counseling parents of retarded children into four major content areas:

(1) factors related to the environment (e.g. placement of the child, educational or training program)
(2) social attitudes (e.g. public opinion toward retardation, institutionalization, neighborhood factors, social life of the family members)
(3) factors related to the child (e.g. reaction to frustration, intellectual-academic limitations, degree of dependency, social limitations, inability to compensate)
(4) factors related to the parents (e.g. physical, social, emotional resources, desire to have other children).

These topics seem to cover the major areas noted by other investigators and those reported as the major themes in counselors' reports.

As the outcome and dynamics of the counseling treatments are considered, a general trend from the discussion of specific and situational problems to the more personal and emotional topics is clearly evident. This seems to be a fairly consistent pattern in counseling (54). In this regard, Rogers and Dymond (54) cited the major goals of counseling in general which seem apropos in this context as well:

(1) greater self-understanding
(2) less need for self-concealment
(3) increased self-direction and responsibility
(4) more confidence, optimism, and comfortableness in relation with others.

Winder (84) stated the two major goals for group counseling with parents of cerebral palsied children which also seem appropriate in regard to retardation: (1) an acceptance by the parents of their cerebral palsied child (not the child and not the problem; or, the problem and not the child), and (2) an acceptance of help from others in the community.

Whereas a number of investigators seemed to dwell upon topics of concern and dynamics inherent in the counseling sessions, Popp et al. (50) commented specifically upon the outcomes of counseling sessions they conducted with 22 parents of the severely retarded in terms of individual participant change or growth. They noted a decrease in defensiveness, an alteration of parental expectancy and acceptance of the child, relief from guilt, shame and anxiety, and reduction in expressions of hostility toward the public schools as outcomes of the group meetings. Gordon and Ullman (25) suggested that the counseling experience often "fortifies" the parent for his efforts in working with the child and helps him define his responsibility for the child in relation to the rest of the family. Morris (45) stressed the importance of the parents deriving some healthful satisfaction in being parents.

As in the case of material relevant to attitudes of the retarded, there is also a paucity of material specifically related to counseling parents of the retarded. No previous studies are reported which employ a pre-and/or post-counseling test or any other type of objective check on change or direction of change due to any form of counseling treatment with parents of the retarded.

CHAPTER III

EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE

III. A. Population Characteristics

All individuals comprising the study population were parents of an educable mentally handicapped child (I.Q. range 50-75). Initial contact with subjects was made possible through the cooperation of the school systems and parent groups in five New York State Communities. These communities had special classes for the educable retardate in operation as part of their regular school program. Individuals who seemed to fit the general criteria for inclusion in the study were contacted by a member of the project staff who explained the general purposes and procedures to be followed. Those who indicated an ability and willingness to participate were administered a detailed interview. (See Appendix A).

At the same time as the interview session, a data sheet (See Appendix A) was filled out by the interviewer. This form was used to record information for the determination of the Index of Status Characteristics (I.S.C.), the basis for socio-economic level, as well as background material concerning the child, siblings, parents, and family history.

The Index of Status Characteristics (I.S.C.) as conceived by Warner, Meeker and Eells (82), is based on the assumption that the economic condition and related factors are highly correlated with social class in our society. It has been widely utilized as a relatively simple, economical, and reliable method for determining the social level of selected residents or a cross-section of the population in a community. There are four status characteristics used in the determination of the Index: Occupation, Source of Income, House Type, and Dwelling Area. Rating in each of these characteristics were obtained for each individual according to a 7-point scale with a one rating being the highest possible. Weights were assigned each of the four ratings according to the relative importance of each characteristic in the total social-class determination as defined by the authors. The resultant summated scores were then related to social class level. For the purposes of this study only those individuals with I.S.C. summated scores ranging above 21 and below 51 were utilized as the population was restricted to the middle class.

One hundred and thirty-seven subjects (63 men, 74 women) comprised the final population and were divided into eight sub-groups for treatment and comparison purposes (Table 1). Rationale for the assignation to groups is presented in the section on Administration.

TABLE 1

STUDY POPULATION FOR ALL TREATMENT GROUPS

Group	Number of Subjects			
	Fathers	Mothers	Total	Cumulative Total
Cazenovia	6	6	12	12
Minnowbrook	7	14	21	33
Once a Month	4	4	8	41
Twice a Month	4	7	11	52
Control	7	8	15	67
Clinic Dropout	4	8	12	(79)
Attrition	3	3	6	(85)
Contact	28	24	52	(137)
	63	74	137	

The chronological age range (Table 2) of the participating parents extended from 28 to 60 with the greatest preponderance in the 35-50 span. The majority had completed 12 years of formal schooling (Table 3) with the range from 7 to 20. One hundred and twenty six individuals or 81 per cent of the total study population represent instances where both members of a couple were participants in one of the groups.

TABLE 2

CHRONOLOGICAL AGE RANGE OF THE STUDY POPULATION

Years of Age	Fathers	Mothers
28	0	1
29	0	0
30	0	3
31	1	1
32	0	1
33	2	3
34	0	1
35	2	4
36	2	9
37	3	3
38	5	3
39	4	4
40	2	5

TABLE 2 (CONT)
CHRONOLOGICAL AGE RANGE OF THE STUDY POPULATION (CONT)

Years of Age	Fathers	Mothers
41	4	0
42	3	2
43	2	4
44	3	8
45	4	3
46	5	2
47	3	1
48	5	5
49	3	3
50	2	3
51	1	1
52	1	0
53	3	2
54	0	0
55	1	0
56	0	0
57	0	0
58	0	2
59	0	0
60	2	0
Total	63	74

TABLE 3

EDUCATION OF THE STUDY POPULATION[A]

Number of Years	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	
Fathers	1	3	1	6	10	12	8	3	3	12	1	1	1	1	63
Mothers	2	2	2	9	11	25	10	4	1	8	0	0	0	0	74

[A] Number of years assigned various kinds of specialized schooling:

Business School	1 year beyond high school (12) unless otherwise indicated
Technical Training	1 year beyond high school (12) unless otherwise indicated
Normal School	2 years beyond high school (12) unless otherwise indicated
Nursing School	2 years beyond high school (12) unless otherwise indicated
Masters Degree	1 year beyond college (16) unless otherwise indicated
Doctorate	3 years beyond college (16) unless otherwise indicated

---

An analysis of the children showed that they were primarily in later childhood and early adolescence, 8 years through 16 years, with a C.A. range of from 5 to 19 years (Table 4). This selective factor may have occurred because of the stronger likelihood of special classes being established at these chronological age levels rather than at the younger range. The sex distribution of the group was 50 girls and 87 boys. The excess of boys over girls is generally expected among the retarded group.

TABLE 4

AGE AND SEX OF THE RETARDED CHILD OF THE PARENTS IN THE STUDY POPULATION

Chronological Age	Frequency		Total
	Male	Female	
5	3	0	3
6	0	0	0
7	0	0	0
8	10	4	14
9	4	5	9
10	5	8	13
11	5	3	8
12	14	7	21
13	9	6	15
14	12	2	14
15	18	4	22
16	5	6	11
17	2	4	6
18	0	0	0
19	0	1	1
Total	87	50	137

III. B. Description of Instruments and Techniques

A number of techniques and measurements were utilized in gathering background information, as well as the expressed attitude of the subjects in relation to need personality variables, attitudes toward child-rearing practices and toward aspects particularly pertinent to retardation. The selection of techniques was designed to secure different levels of reactions and interactions from an objective structured viewpoint to a quasi-structured one which provided for greater expression of personal elements.

In order to secure the necessary data, each subject was interviewed and assessed with four instruments: The Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI), The Attitude Scale Toward Mental Retardation (AMR), The Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC), and The Stern Activities Index (SAI).

III. B-1. Interview

A semi-structured interview (Appendix A)* was administered individually to each tentative participant in the study. The average length of the interview session was two hours. The parents were never interviewed together in order to assure a free expression of ideas and details.

The interviewers attempted to investigate five general aspects of the family situation and the impact and relationship of the retarded child within the family and community environment. The major topics included were:

---

*See illustration of sample interview in Appendix B.

A. Intra-Family. Items elicited a description from the parent of the retarded child's position within the family constellation generally, and specifically in regard to relationships with the parents, siblings, special considerations, reactions to routine of the family, and parental control.

B. Neighborhood. Aspects of the parents' perception and parental reaction to the child's relationship with other children and adults were sought.

C. Activity - Goals. The school and social experiences of the child were reviewed. An estimate of parental expectation and satisfaction with present progress was obtained.

D. Community. The history of the recognition of the retardation and an indication of initial and subsequent reactions of the parents to the knowledge was elicited. A synopsis of the professional assistance and contacts in regard to the retardation or associated problems was made. Also, an indication as to the degree of reconciliation to the handicap was sought.

E. Parental Relationships. An attempt was made to determine the impact of the retarded child upon the parental relationship and the effect upon activities engaged in, the home role of both parents, and social life in general.

The interviewers took notes during the process of the interview and recorded exact statements as frequently as possible. The subjective judgment of the interviewer was recorded in a separate summarization section.

The interview was quantified by utilization of a technique developed by Dollard (19). A Discomfort score was given if the statement expressed "suffering, tension, pain, unhappiness, disturbance, annoyance, excitement, appetitiveness, apprehension, drive, want, and negative statements." A Relief rating was scored if the response expressed "comfort, satisfaction, enjoyment, a sense of well-being, relaxation, drive reduction, reward, pleasure, and positive statements." A Neutral scoring was given if the response indicated neither discomfort nor relief or was a description of instrumental behavior. An inter-scorer reliability on eight individual scorers was reported by Dollard as .80 for word interpretation; .81 for sentences; and .88 when rated by thought units.

A Discomfort Relief Quotient (DRQ) was obtained for each individual for each of the five sub-categories covered in the interview format. The scorer rated each statement or item response within each category by giving it a Discomfort, a Relief, or a Neutral designation.

A DRQ was obtained by dividing the Discomfort total by the total number of Discomfort plus total Relief scores $(\frac{D}{D + R})$ for each category. Five category sub-totals were thereby obtained. They were not combined into a total instrument score, but were treated separately. The thought unit used as the basic scoring unit which was in most instances a sentence, a phrase, a clause, and in some cases a word, if it expressed an independent unit of thought.

III. B-2. Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI)

The Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI)(Appendix A), is an inventory of attitudes toward child-rearing practices as they relate to parent and child personalities, as well as parent-child relationships. Two forms specifically designed for mothers and fathers were used in this investigation.

The instrument was developed by Drs. Earl S. Schaefer and Richard Q. Bell (63) of the Section on Child Development, National Institute of Mental Health, Bethesda, Maryland. The description of the categories was delineated by the present investigators. Satisfactory reliability estimates of internal consistency and test-retest were reported on the various categories. Concurrent validity was demonstrated in comparing the PARI Scales with the Shoben (68) and Mark (42) instruments. Most of the scales were developed through the selection of major operational concepts of child-rearing first, followed by the identification of specific trait-actions relative to the concept.

Mother Form

The mother form as used in this investigation consists of 133 items, each of which is responded to by the individual according to a four-choice continuum: A. Strongly Agree; a. Mildly Agree; d. Mildly Disagree; D. Strongly Disagree. For scoring and interpretation, the mother PARI is divided into 26 categories. It is important to note that the present form of the PARI which comprises 23 categories was extended to include three additional categories -- Expression of Affection, Autonomy of the Child, and Achievement.

Scales such as Expression of Affection and Autonomy of the Child, while they do not discriminate highly between groups according to past analyses of Bell and Schaefer, are included for the maintenance and encouragement of rapport of the subjects toward a positive attitude toward the testing procedure. In addition, they were included to provide clinical insights into the attitudes of parents. Achievement was incorporated from the father form of the PARI to provide comparative information.

The categories and their descriptions are:

1. Encouraging Verbalization. Encouragement of expression, including differences of opinion; importance and value of opinions of children.

2. Fostering Dependency. Over-protection and over-possessiveness by the parent so that the child will not face disappointment, frustration and failure.

3. Seclusiveness of the Mother. Achieving gratification through home and family; denial of need for outside pursuits and interests; sublimation into the home-making role.

4. Breaking the Will. The need to instill fear and recognition of parental and general adult dominance in order to prevent malevolent and mischievous behavior.

5. Marital Conflict. The inevitability of marital tension and conflict.

6. Strictness. The desirability of the utilization of disciplinary measures which tend to develop a child who has good character and is happier.

7. Irritability. The difficult and "nerve-wracking" job of rearing children.

8. Exluding Outside Influences. The child is not permitted to question parental authority and dominance, either through insight or external influences (which might color the child's point of view toward the parents).

9. Deification of Parent. Reverence and unquestioning loyalty to the parent who may be regarded as infallible and wise.

10. Suppression of Aggression. The desirability and necessity for avoiding physically aggressive acts by parental (or other authority figures) decision or instruction.

11. Equalitarianism. The recognition by parents that their children should have equal status and rights through reciprocity in interaction.

12. Avoidance of Communication. A restriction or a non-committal attitude toward communication through the expression of hostility or anxiety.

13. Inconsiderateness of Husband. Assignation of blame for inadequacy in maternal role to neglect, lack of cooperation of husband; expression of desire for support, cooperation, understanding from husband.

14. Suppression of Sexuality. The restriction of sexual concepts which may be elicited in curiosity, play or exposure.

15. Ascendancy of Mother. Role of competent and powerful mother in home management; effect upon family and individuals in the home.

16. Comradeship and Sharing. Closeness of the intra-familial relationship and desirability for reciprocal positive behavior which results in a more effective and a happier child.

17. Expression of Affection. The fulfillment of the need for protection and of support of the child by recognition of emotional needs; and importance of the individual in the familial constellation.

18. Autonomy of Child. Expression of recognition and desire of the parent for the child to act independently and apart from the parents.

19. Achievement. Desirability of goal-striving encouragement; parental role in motivation and control of child's activities; need for encouragement, goal extensions; importance of goal setting.

20. Martyrdom. Drawing attention to personal suffering, self-sacrifice; statement of lack of recognition, support and gratitude.

21. Fear of Harming the Baby. Expression of fear of hurting the infant in normal activities; reflection on resultant guilt if the infant is harmed.

22. Rejection of the Homemaking Role. Reaction to the restrictive aspect of homemaking and child-rearing role; expression of aggression or irritability toward motherhood.

23. Approval of Activity. The child is urged to consistently strive, keep busy, and not waste time in order to assure future success and happiness.

24. Intrusiveness. An awareness that the child has the ability and should be allowed to do thinking without subjection to parental pressure.

25. Acceleration of Development. Emphasizes that parents try to start their child early in toilet training, walking and feeding.

26. Dependency of the Mother. Statements regarding adequacy in performing child-rearing role; reaction to being left alone, independence in role performance.

Scoring Procedure and Analysis

In scoring the items, a numerical score of 4 was assigned to the A. Strongly Agree response; 3 to a. Mildly Agree; 2 to d. Mildly Disagree; and 1 to D. Strongly Disagree. The item scores in each category were combined so that 26 category scores were obtained for each individual.

Father Form

The form of the PARI used with the fathers (61) consists of 240 items. This larger number of items is due to the fact that this form has not yet been refined to the point of elimination of non-differentiating items. The instrument is divided into 30 categories, each comprised of eight items.

1. Encouraging Verbalization (See mother form).
2. Fostering Dependency. (See mother form).
3. Seclusiveness. (See mother form).
4. Breaking the Will. (See mother form).
5. Marital Conflict. (See mother form).
6. Strictness. (See mother form)
7. Irritability. (See mother form)
8. Excluding Outside Influences. (See mother form).
9. Deification of Parent. (See mother form).
10. Suppression of Aggression. (See mother form).
11. Equalitarianism. (See mother form).
12. Avoidance of Communication. (See mother form).
13. Inconsiderateness of Wife. (See mother form).
14. Suppression of Sexuality. (See mother form).
15. Ascendancy of Husband. (See mother form).
16. Comradeship and Sharing. (See mother form).
17. Expression of Affection. (See mother form).
18. Autonomy of Child. (See mother form).
19. Achievement Demand. (See mother form).
20. Harsh Punishment. Need for physical disciplinary measures for the good of the child in regard to disobedience and misbehavior.
21. Deception. Need for deception, trickery in dealing with children; role of need for honesty in child-rearing; time and effort economy and long range effects of deceptive measures.

22. Non-punishment. Reaction to physical punishment; aftereffects on child and on parent-child relationships.

23. Demanding Activity. Constant activity; striving; aftereffects during life span; role of parents in activity pattern.

24. Irresponsibility of Father. Restriction of parental role; demands on time and freedom.

25. Avoidance of Expression of Affection. Role and extent of showing of affection to children; inter-parental affection in the presence of children; reaction of the child to the display of affection.

26. Complaint of Ascendancy of Wife. Comparative role of husband-wife in family constellation; reaction to dominance and sufficiency of wife; effect upon home life and children.

27. Suppression of Affection. Social desirability of exercising overt control of emotional reactions; need for teaching control early in life.

28. Change Orientation. Adaptation to status quo; acceptance and satisfaction with self in understanding one's limitations; importance of teaching children this concept and its effect upon life adjustment.

29. Forcing Independence. Need for children to learn to carry out activities independently; to learn to protect selves with lack of parental control and assistance.

30. Past Orientation. Emphasis on current modes of thinking and behaving in contrast to past.

Scoring Procedure and Analysis

Administration and scoring procedures are the same as those followed in the treatment of the mother form of the instrument.

Comparison of Mothers and Fathers - Scoring Procedure and Analysis

Initial examination and item analysis of the PARI father scales by Schaefer and Bell (61) indicated that some of the concepts which were reliably measured for mothers show very little variability among the fathers who were studied. Therefore, only 19 comparably named categories appear on both the mother and father forms of the PARI.

1. Encouraging Verbalization
2. Fostering Dependency
3. Seclusiveness
4. Breaking the Will
5. Marital Conflict
6. Equalitarianism
7. Expression of Affection
8. Suppression of Aggression
9. Deification of Parent
10. Excluding Outside Influences
11. Irritability
12. Strictness
13. Suppression of Sexuality
14. Ascendancy of Mate
15. Comradeship and Sharing
16. Inconsiderateness of Mate
17. Avoidance of Communication
18. Autonomy of Child
19. Achievement Demand

In order to have an equal weighting for mother and father subjects when considering analyses of group totals, the eight items per category of the father form were pro-rated by multiplying each category total on the father form by 5/8. The Achievement category has eight items on both forms so this score was not adjusted.

III. B-3. Attitude Scale Toward Mental Retardation (AMR)

The Attitude Scale Toward Mental Retardation (Appendix A) was developed with a primary focus upon the specific attitudes of parents toward retardation. The specific items and areas of emphasis were formulated on the basis of observations culled from clinical experience. They were designed to glean both positive and negative responses of attitudes toward the retarded child without requiring a personalized reference to the individual child. It is assumed that by this method the respondents would tend to project to their own situation and personalize their response by reflecting their inner feelings with less emotional blocking and conflict.

The AMR Scale has 256 items which are divided into 33 categories of logically derived clinical clusters. Seventeen of these categories represent original scales derived for this instrument, and the other 16 categories are determined from items in the PARI which were rewritten with a specific reference to retardation. This innovation was used to test the relationship of the generality and specificity of attitudes. The rewriting process involved only the insertion of the word "retarded" or "mentally retarded." As an example, an item on the PARI which states: "The child should not question the thinking of his parents", when rewritten becomes, "The retarded child should not question the thinking of his parents."

In order to obtain maximum statistical power for scoring the data, all item scores were placed in the same direction.

The categories of the AMR Scale and their clinical descriptions are:

1. Sexuality. Suppression of knowledge, behavior, expression and function; focus on activities which infer or include suppression and

expression of sexual awareness, excitation, behavior and function. These activities may culminate in marriage or procreation of inferior progeny.

2. Genetic Responsibility. Reference to hereditary causation; assignation or rejection of responsibility for the defective gene.

3. Appearance. Emphasis on physical appearance and capability for social responsibility.

4. Normalcy of Development. Concern with comparing retardates with normals in relation to social and emotional adjustment, understanding of self/world, and making a contribution to society.

5. Dependency. Suggests lack of initiative; recognition of helplessness and need for support and protection in home, vocational, and social aspects of living.

6. Independency. Includes initiative to sustain activity without support or protection; lack of felt or expressed need for ego assistance; and resistive avoidant reaction to dicta imposed by dominant figures.

7. Aggression. Stress on desirability and necessity of expression; suppression of implied or overt aggressive acts through verbal, physical or psychological media.

8. Guilt. Emphasis on anxiety and shame as reflected in the intra-familial reactions of fear and self-recrimination to retardation and related social ramifications from the community upon the family.

9. Peer Interaction. Relates to acceptance or rejection of/by normal and retarded peers which may/may not influence social infusion.

10. Concept of Retardation. Reference to general effects of retardation upon an individual's existence which highlight the severity and onus of the problem; conceptual framework about retardation and comparative reactions to other handicaps.

11. Abasement. Reflects feelings of insecurity through expression of personal inadequacy, and self-debasement for the retardate's inferior role in society and/or fear for the future.

12. Comprehension of Self/Others. Includes awareness of limitations; need for differentiation of standards and recognition of physical, social and intellectual characteristics.

13. Counteraction - Re-striving. Implies a desire to compensate or overcome feelings of inadequacy or failure by suppressing acceptance of limitations and re-striving to achieve.

14. Educational Implications and Treatment. Deals with eligibility, school placement, educational aspirations and goals, academic experiences.

15. Community Provision. Deals with feasible vocational and social placement which may indicate non-segregation or segregation from the community or family.

16. Emotional - Social Behavior. Includes general concepts of emotional needs and social and emotional patterns of reacting and distinctions between mental illness and retardation.

(For description of categories 17-33 see Mother PARI section)

17.	Expression of Affection	(PARI - 17)
18.	Suppression of Sexuality	(PARI - 14)
19.	Encouraging Verbalization	(PARI - 1)
20.	Excluding Outside Influences	(PARI - 8)
21.	Avoidance of Communication	(PARI - 12)
22.	Suppression of Aggression	(PARI - 10)
23.	Deification of Parent	(PARI - 9)
24.	Comradeship and Sharing	(PARI - 16)
25.	Strictness	(PARI - 6)
26.	Breaking the Will	(PARI - 4)
27.	Irritability	(PARI - 7)
28.	Autonomy of Child	(PARI - 18)
29.	Equalitarianism	(PARI - 11)
30.	Approval of Activity	(PARI - 23)

31. Fostering Dependency (PARI - 2)
32. Acceleration of Development (PARI - 25)
33. Achievement (PARI - 19)

Scoring Procedure and Analysis

The items are scored on a 4-point continuum of Strongly Agree, Mildly Agree, Mildly Disagree, and Strongly Disagree, with assignments of numerical values of 4, 3, 2, 1, respectively. The item scores in each category are combined so that 33 category scores are obtained for each individual.

Test Reliability

Reliability of the AMR Scale, which was determined by the split-half technique with the Spearman-Brown correction, is .95 for parents of retarded children and .93 for parents who have normal children. A test-retest coefficient of .96 was obtained with a population of parents of normal children, and one of .70 with a group of parents of the retarded.

III. B-4. Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC)

The Gradient Sentence Completion Test (Appendix A) is a series of 149 open-ended sentence stems with varying and gradient degrees of stem structure which are intended to elicit a variety of emotional responses as well as dynamic levels of interaction.

These stems are concentrated about four general attitude or content areas:

1. Familial attitudes
2. Social and sexual attitudes
3. General attitudes
4. Attitudes relating to character traits

The items are divided among 18 categories according to stem content:

1. Attitude toward Mother
2. Attitude toward Father
3. Attitude toward Parents
4. Attitude toward Family Unit
5. Attitude toward Women
6. Attitude toward Men
7. Attitude toward School
8. Attitude toward Friends and Acquaintances
9. Attitude toward Fears
10. Attitude toward Guilt Feelings
11. Attitude toward One's Own Ability
12. Attitude toward the Past
13. Attitude toward the Future
14. Attitude toward Goals
15. Attitude toward Child
16. Attitude toward Husband (wife form)
16. Attitude toward Wife (husband form)
17. Attitude toward Retardation
18. General Items

Thirty-five variables were used in this interpretation process:

1. Abasement

A quality regarding a reference to self, conditions, ideas, others; statement of inadequacy; self-criticism, reaction to inadequacy, weakness, trait; to apologize; to depreciate oneself; to accept punishment of self; masochism.

2. Achievement

Non-educative focus on self or others; emphasis on enumerated goal, designated placement; specific striving; stated achievement need, goal; statement of limitation, (in) adequacy or ability; generalized ego ideal, perfectionist implication; generalized response regarding a means to a goal, traits, conditions; recognition of means for attaining goal; to seek, receive honor, fame, commendation; to complete and build; produce, extend, progress, pursue; hamper, impede; recognition of lack of progress. Attempt to change, adjust condition of retardation; reference to aspiration; comparison normal and retarded. To beget a child.

3. Acquiescence

Differs from Sentience (29) only in matter of degree. Surface acceptance of a fact, situation; static situation; status quo; statement or description of a pleasant situation, contentment, complacency; reference to appropriateness of situation; a generalized value statement; adequacy of idea, situation, "pleased with lot"; "on the fence" statements, rejection of stem but acceptance of situation.

4. Acquisition

To seek, acquire, buy, take food, drink, nourishment, objects, possessions, situations; greedily to work for money or goods; to bargain or gamble; to want, like, retain, defend possessions or property; loss of possessions, prosperity; economy, frugality, miserliness; specific reference to business dealings -- buy, sell, get orders.

5. Affiliation

An interaction; to be sociable, make friends; to do things with one's family, have fun together, sharing activities, ideas; curiosity, cooperation; loss of people i.e., death; wanting associations, people; description of associations; acknowledgment of relationship.

6. Aggression

Verbal or physical activity regarding individuals and situations; to criticize, blame, accuse, ridicule maliciously; sadism; to injure, kill, fight; punish; to use force, coercion; meanness, cruelty; exploitation by people; to defend self verbally against blame or criticism.

7. Autonomy

A general reference to being free and independent of others; stated need for freedom, independence.

8. Avoidance

Generalized activity of avoiding; to exhibit caution, carefulness, concealment; to avoid, escape blame or danger by inhibiting social impulses, by fight or concealment of guilt; to fear, avoid ostracism, censure, punishment; to avoid shame, failure, humiliation; to hide or take protective measures.

9. Benignness

Expression of kindness, goodness, thoughtfulness, considerateness regarding situations, places, individuals, conditions, animals; a generalized expression of goodness or moral quality; moral values -- good, bad; sweet, loving, kind, nice, loveable; "idealism"; expression of sense of humor.

10. Counteraction

Process of generalized restriving, after failure, discouragement; to overcome stated weakness.

11. Deference

Prominent focus on others; to admire, follow an object, institution, person; to give, seek, receive attention, praise, appreciation, admiration; to yield with generalized emphasis.

12. Description

To relate facts; descriptive reference to locality, states, fears, guilt, objects, people, situations; non-scorable exclamatory or cliche response to stem; description of neutral stem.

13. Dominance

To influence or control others, self; leadership, (mis)lead, guide, handle, cope with, control, give orders, impose self control;

value statement of control; parental restriction of child by author; reference to behavior -- good, well, (mis)behave.

14. Identification

Expression of sameness, resemblance in physical, verbal, emotional behavior regarding individuals or groups; empathy; specific ego ideal; recognition; identification of a specific person with a quality or set of traits.

15. Integrity

To give, command, associate respect, loyalty, honesty, dependability, decency, sincerity; reference to deception; cheating; to steal, snatch objects, possessions.

16. Intellectualism

Generalized response to generic learning; need for learning, education, teaching; reference to school or college, educational placement, academic activity, reading and writing; philosophical inquiry; to think out explanations, logical relationships; procedural plans; reasoning quality of response stated; statement of awareness of intellectual activity; curiosity regarding phenomena, to observe, inquire, explore, investigate; explain, judge, interpret, lecture, expound; knowledge of situations, facts.

17. Irritability

Generalized expression of anxiety -- worry, concern, tension; statement of irritating, frustrating, unpleasant situation, condition, state, trait which is non-scorable by other content.

18. Narcissism

Self-absorption, admiration, admiration, display; displaying an extravagant manner; selfishness; delusions of grandeur.

19. Nurturance

To recognize, nourish, protect, help, assist, give to, take care of, nourish an object or individual; to express sympathy; to mother, father a child (not beget); specific reference to adequacy of parental role; to give food, drink, nourishment.

20. Omission

No response; incomplete or incomprehensible response; statement of non-existent topic.

21. Optimism

Expression of a positive attitude; generalized pleasantness, success toward the future.

22. Order

Diffuse states related to ideas, processes, situations; to put things in order; to achieve cleanliness, arrangement, organization, balance, neatness, precision; confusion, uncertainty; reference to appropriateness of act, situation.

23. Pessimism

Expression of negative attitude; generalized unpleasantness, failure toward future.

24. Phobia

An emotionalized description; generalized statement of fears regarding conditions, activities, situations, people, animals; recognition of, reaction to fears.

25. Play

Statement of activity regarding self, others; to relax tension and alleviate stress by pleasurable, humorous, irresponsible activity of a motor, verbal, mental nature; to retire, vacation, travel, dance, play, take part in any form of recreation.

26. Refusal

A complete and comprehensible response to a stem but a surface refusal to respond in direction or intent of stem with no other scorable content, all nots, noes, nothings, nevers; denial that situation exists or has existed.

27. Rejection

Process or state related to people or ideas stated in response; disagreement; indifference, scorn, detachment; exclusion or ignoring of inferior objects, individuals, situations; depreciation of people, conditions, institutions, content, value of content; statement of a problem with no other scorable content; a burden, cross to bear, handicap, depreciation of an interacting mode or characteristic; statement of questionable value.

28. Seclusion

To be alone, inconspicuous; to maintain privacy; keep secret.

29. Sentience

To enjoy sensuous pleasure, experiences, objects, ideas, food and drink; happiness and related states; expression of pleasure, aesthetics-wonderful, thrilling, swell, fun, enjoyment, thrills, new sensations, drama.

30. Sex

To participate in heterosexual relationship; to court; to enjoy, participate in intercourse; to enjoy, appreciate opposite sex; expressions of strength, virility.

31. Submissiveness

To react overtly and proceed in a passive manner; to give up to individuals, situations, comply, surrender; to be inactive; to receive benefits without effort; indifference, apathy.

32. Succorance

To seek, take, receive, desire, need aid, protection, sympathy, rest, relaxation, outlets; to indulge in self-pity; to wish for courage, assistance; to pout, sulk.

33. Supernatural-Teleological

Reference to god, faith, blessings, mysticism, fate, destiny, luck, fortune; statement of miracles; acquiescence to extra-human power.

34. Understanding

Understanding individuals, situations, conditions, self; awareness of an individual's feelings, thoughts, empathy; tolerance, patience; self-confidence; self-realization - "soul searching" attitude; uncertainty regarding ideas, decisions, crystallizations; similar to vagueness, haziness.

35. Unhappiness

Sadness, unhappiness, unpleasantness; grief, distress, upsetting state or situation.

Scoring Procedure and Analysis

The assignation of both direction and variable scores to the responses regardless of the stem was guided by a set of criteria in order to achieve greater reliability of scoring procedure.

A positive (+) direction score was given a response if it indicated a favorable expression of interaction of the individual and the stimulus, i.e., acceptance, relief, or approval. A negative (-) direction score was given a response indicating an unfavorable attitude toward interaction with the stimulus, i.e., an expression of conflict, disturbance, or disapproval. A neutral (o) score was given when the stimulus response indicated no quality interaction by the respondent, i.e., either an omission, incomplete thought, or a non-interaction factual statement, such as a purely descriptive one. With few exceptions, any of the three direction scores could conceivably be accompanied by any of the variable designations. In scoring, direction and psychological content of the response were generally considered independent of the stem content.

To increase reliability of the scoring procedure, a hierarchy of primary and secondary variables was established. (1) If a variety or series of descriptions were listed in a response, the last mentioned scorable item was used. Exception was made when several of the descriptions could be categorized by one variable, then that variable was scored. (2) In instances where qualifications (i.e., a reason) were included in a response to a stem, the qualification received primary scoring. Example: "I believe-------I have the ability to accomplish a lot. Why don't I? I'm lazy," is scored Abasement rather than Achievement. (3) The content or end of an interaction was given priority over process or means to an end. (4) Where two variable categories were mentioned with equal directness, one was selected as a primary category. A hierarchy among variables was established for uniformity in judging items expressing two needs with equal directness. The variable categories of Achievement, Acquiescence, Counteraction, Description, Irritability, Optimism, Pessimism, and Refusal were noted as secondary categories. Likewise certain dynamic priorities of sets of dichotomous or continuous variables needed to be established in terms of basic interactions: Dominance over Aggression, Sentience over Play and Affiliation, Play over Affiliation, and Rejection over Affiliation.

Test Reliability

As this was an original instrument constructed for the purpose of this study, measures of reliability were obtained for both variable and direction scorings. An odd-even reliability coefficient of .96 with Spearman-Brown correction was obtained for the category variables, and .85 for the direction scores.

Interscorer Reliability

Interscorer reliability on two aspects was computed by use of the Pearson r technique. Consistency between the scorers on the Gradient

Sentence Completion Test was measured for both direction scores (the plus, minus, or zero rating assigned to each response) and variable scores (the labeling of each response as Abasement, Achievement, etc.)

The reliability coefficient shows a high interscorer reliability in judging the variable scores. The Pearson r for the variable scores was .97. Pearson r's for the same two judges on direction scores within each category were determined by weighting the plus scores, 1, the minus scores, 2, and the zero scores, 3. The reliability coefficient for scoring direction on a protocol was .99. This is significantly greater than 50% at the .01 level. These values demonstrate a basic consistency between the scorers in the assignation of direction scores to individual items.

To further check on interscorer reliability, a percentage of agreement was obtained. Two judges agreed 84% in scoring variables over an entire protocol. To further check reliability, three additional protocols were randomly selected, and the same two judges showed agreements of 78%, 80%, and 83%. These percentages of agreement were shown to be significantly better than 50% agreement at the .01 level. These values further indicate a high consistency of agreement between scorers in the assigning of variable scores.

III. B-5. Stern Activities Index (SAI)

The Stern Activities Index (Form 156) (71) is an instrument which measures manifest personality variables based upon Murray's need theory relative to the interpersonal and intrapersonal states of the individual.

The individual respondent reacts to each of 300 items by indicating either a like or dislike for the subject or activity concerned. It is assumed that his personal needs will be reflected in his expression of potential interest or participation within a specific set of behavioral activities.

Forty-two need variables are included in the Activities Index.

1. Abasement. Self-depreciation and devaluation; acknowledgment of mistakes, failures, and humiliation.

2. Achievement. Surmounting obstacles (physical, personal, or interpersonal) and proving personal worth.

3. Adaptiveness -- Defendance. Acceptance of advice and criticism versus concealment or justification of failure or humiliation.

4. Affiliation. Close, friendly, reciprocal associations with others.

5. Aggression -- Blameavoidance. Overt or covert hostility towards others versus the denial of such impulses.

6. Autonomy. (See Succorance).

7. Blameavoidance. (See Aggression).

8. Change -- Sameness. Unroutinized, changeable behavior versus repetitive, perseverative action patterns.

9. Conjunctivity -- Disjunctivity. Organization of cognitive activities versus uncoordinated, diffuse, or non-conforming behavior.

10. Counteraction. Restriving in order to overcome experienced frustration, failure or humiliation.

11. Defendance. (See Adaptiveness).

12. Deference. Sycophantic submission to the opinions and preferences of others perceived as superior.

13. Deliberation (See Impulsion).

14. Disjunctivity. (See Conjunctivity).

15. Dominance. Assertive or manipulated control over others.

16. Ego Achievement. Self-dramatizing, idealistic social action; active or fantasied achievement oriented in terms of personal potency, influence, or power.

17. Emotionality -- Placidity. Intensive, active emotional expression versus calm, serene, restrained responsiveness.

18. Energy -- Passivity. Intense, sustained, vigorous effort versus sluggish inertia.

19. Exhibition. Self-display and attention-seeking.

20. Fantasied Achievement. Daydreams of success in achieving extraordinary personal recognition; narcissistic aspirations for personal distinction and power.

21. Harmavoidance. Avoidance, withdrawal, or protection from situations which might result in physical pain, injury, illness or death.

22. Humanism. The manipulation of external social objects or artifacts through empirical analysis, reflection, and discussion.

23. Impulsion -- Deliberation. Impulsive, spontaneous, impetuous, unreflected behavior versus careful, cautious, considered, deliberative behavior.

24. Infavoidance. Avoidance, withdrawal as protection from situations which might result in frustration, failure, humiliation or embarrassment. (Measured as the inverse of both Exhibitionism and Counteraction.)

25. Narcissism. Preoccupation with self.

26. Nurturance. Supporting others by providing love, assistance and protection.

27. Objectivity -- Projectivity. Rejection of superstition versus magical, artistic, egocentric perceptions and beliefs.

28. Order. Organization of the immediate physical environment; preoccupation with neatness, order, arrangement, and meticulous detail.

29. Passivity. (See Energy).

30. Placidity. (See Emotionality).

31. Play. Pursuit of amusement and entertainment.

32. Pragmatism. Practical, concrete achievement; adaptation to reality "as given" and the manipulation of external objects (physical or social) for more or less immediately tangible ends.

33. Projectivity. (See Objectivity).

34. Prudery. (See Sex).

35. Reflectiveness. Intraceptive activities; introspective preoccupation with private psychological, spiritual, esthetic, or metaphysical experience.

36. Rejection. Disassociation from others, withholding friendship and support. (Measured as the inverse of both Affiliation and Nurturance.)

37. Sameness. (See Change).

38. Scientism. The manipulation of external physical objects through empirical analysis, reflection, and discussion.

39. Sentience. Sensuous or voluptuous self-gratification.

40. Sex -- Prudery. Erotic interest or expression versus the denial of such impulses.

41. Succorance -- Autonomy. Dependence on others for love, assistance and protection versus detachment, independence, and rebellion.

42. Understanding. Detached intellectualization; problem solving, analysis, or abstraction as an end in itself.

III. C. Procedure

III. C-1. Administration of Instruments

In the administration of the instruments, the subjects were encouraged to continue at a fairly rapid pace in reading and responding to the various items. They were asked not to ponder for unreasonable lengths of time over any one item under the assumption that by securing the initial response the likelihood of getting at inner feelings and the avoidance of stereotyped, conventionally appropriate responses was increased. Discussion or verbal reaction between subjects or with the examiner to any of the items and their content was withheld until the testing session was completed.

The sequence followed for the administration of the four instruments was kept constant. They were presented in the order in which they are explained in Section B. The administration of the PARI Scale on general child-rearing practices preceded the AMR relating to retardation specifically in an effort to avoid formation and effect of a set. They were administered in small group and individual sessions, depending upon the circumstances inherent in specific situations. In a few isolated situations where a subject could not attend the group testing session, the instruments were completed at home alone and returned by mail or were secured by a member of the project staff. The nature of the construction and format of the instruments and individual items was such that a subject could progress without difficulty on his own initiative throughout the entire battery. In one or two isolated situations where physical conditions interfered (arthritis, severe visual problem), the examiner read the items to the subject for completion, or recorded the subject's response for him.

III. C-2. Counseling Format and Procedure

Counseling was provided for two general purposes: the securance of information by the parent relative to the retardation; and the provision of an opportunity for some personal discussion of the impact of retardation upon the family.

After completion of all personal interviews, individuals were assigned to specific groups in accordance with personal convenience and geographical location. Every effort was made not to include both mates from a family in the same counseling group.

Four experimental groups received counseling of different lengths of time intervals between counseling sessions. They are the Cazenovia, Minnowbrook, Twice a Month, and Once a Month groups.

As can be noted in the schema of the project design, there were two major subdivisions of the experimental clinic treatment - Concentrated and Distributed. Concentrated clinic groups are designated as the Cazenovia and the Minnowbrook sections. In those two instances, all discussion sessions were held over a short and concentrated time period. Members of the Distributed clinic groups received their counseling over a much more extended time span. In both Concentrated sections there was a preponderance of husband and wife mates. They were separated in the small group sessions for facility of expression. A balance of the sexes was attempted whenever possible in scheduling all groups. Members of the two groups, comprising Once a Month and Twice a Month, met in their respective communities in New York State with a counselor for a period of from 2 and ½ to 3 hours in the evening either once or twice a month.

The initial counseling session was immediately preceded by the pre-test (Test I) situation and a general orientation as to the format and purposes of the sessions and the project. Six meetings were scheduled for each of the clinic groups. Two of these sessions were allotted to information-giving purposes from a consultant on a variety of topics, such as educational aspects, vocational placement, and other areas of concern and interest. Some time during these two sessions was also provided for questions. The other four sessions were conducted by a counselor on a semi-structured basis with the focus being upon the identification and discussion of specific problems and concerns of the participants. The counselor acted as a catalyst in stimulating concepts for questioning, pointing up issues for clarification, and developing ideas to help the parents plan for their children. At the end of the sessions, the counselors attempted to assist the group in formulating a summarization of the topics considered, as well as to point up areas for desired further consideration. The counselors kept notes during each session and summarized these immediately thereafter.* At the completion of the series of counseling sessions, the subjects were again administered the complete battery of instruments (Test II or Post-Test I).

According to the project design, specific implementation of the over-all procedural format was varied in terms of time lapse between counseling sessions for different treatment groups. A waiting period from 6 to 9 months ensued during which the subjects had no contact with the project personnel. At the end of this time, the battery of instruments (Post-Test II or Test III) was again administered to all subjects who had completed the two previous testings and the six counseling sessions. Table 5 graphically illustrates the experimental design.

A number of other groups were formed for more interpretive analysis of the data. These groups, Attrition and Clinic Dropout, were created because of their failure to complete the six counseling sessions although they were originally assigned to one of the counseling treatment categories. In addition, interview data from a Contact Group, which includes all other participants in the study, were gathered for utilization in appropriate situations.

---

*Excerpts from a counselor's clinical notes for a series of meetings for one counseling group is included in Appendix B.

TABLE 5

COUNSELING AND TEST ADMINISTRATION OF STUDY POPULATION

				6-9 months time span
Cazenovia	Test I	Counseling: 1 weekend	Test II	Test III
Minnowbrook	Test I	Counseling: 1 week	Test II	Test III
Once a Month	Test I	Counseling: once a month for 6 months	Test II	Test III
Twice a Month	Test I	Counseling: twice a month for 3 months	Test II	Test III
Control	Test I	No counseling	No test	Test II
Clinic Dropout	Test I	Counseling: one to three sessions	No test	No test
Attrition	Test I	No counseling	No test	No test
Contact	No test	No counseling	No test	No test

III. C-3. Statistical Analyses

Analysis of the data from the DRQ, PARI, AMR, and SAI was made on the basis of category scores. The G.S.C. data was considered both by the clinical variable scores and the direction responses.

To secure more intensive information, statistical analysis of the data was done by total groups, male sub-groups, and female sub-groups.

The data for the majority of questions being investigated by the research were statistically treated by either the analysis of variance or a t-test technique. Both methods were programmed on the IBM 650 computer and a great part of the statistical analyses were completed by this service.

Analysis of variance was used to determine: initial random distribution of the entire study population (Question 3); the significance of the effect of counseling treatment in general upon the attitudes and need personality structure (Question 4); and the significance of the influence of the length of the counseling period upon the attitudes and need personality structure of the parents (Question 5).

The analysis of variance formulae used in these considerations were:

$$\Sigma\Sigma(X-\bar{X})^2 = X^2 - \frac{(\Sigma\Sigma X)^2}{N} \qquad \text{for the total sum;}$$

$$\overset{r}{\Sigma}\Sigma(X - \bar{X}r)^2 = \Sigma\Sigma X^2 - \overset{r}{\Sigma}\frac{(\ X)^2}{Mr} \qquad \text{for the within sum; and}$$

$$\overset{r}{\Sigma} M_r\ (\bar{X}_r - \bar{X})^2 = \overset{r}{\Sigma}\frac{(\Sigma X)^2}{Mr} - \frac{(\Sigma\Sigma X)^2}{N} \qquad \text{for the between sum. (43)}$$

An independent t-test was used in the statistical treatment of a number of the questions: the significance of the effect of the length of the overall counseling period (Question 6); the significance of the differences between male and female subjects (Question 7); the significance of the differences in attitude and need personality structure between the experimental and the test control groups (Question 8); and the significance of the difference between those who completed counseling and - those who dropped out after 1-3 sessions (Question 9), - those who took the initial test battery but attended no counseling sessions (Question 10), - those who were interviewed but were unable to attend any testing or counseling sessions (Question 11).

The t-test formula used in these situations was: (21)

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{n_1\sigma_1^2 + n_2\sigma_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}\right)}}$$

One question, the significance of the differences between general and specific attitudes, was investigated by use of the matched t-test technique. The formula used was:

$$t = \frac{\bar{X} - M}{\frac{S}{\sqrt{N - 1}}}$$

All statistical data were tested at the .01 and .05 level of confidence. In the tabular presentations the .10 level of significance is also cited in order for the reader to note trends inherent in the data.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As previously indicated, twelve questions relating to the attitude and need personality structure of the parents of educable mentally handicapped children are being considered in the treatment of the data. Because of the magnitude of the data, consideration of each of these questions will be taken individually. Within the framework of each question, a consistent sequence in terms of instrument and treatment groups will be followed. On the analysis of variance, only significant interactions will be reported in this section, while the total results, including the non-significant interactions, will be shown in Appendix C.

QUESTION I. WHAT IS THE ATTITUDE STRUCTURE OF PARENTS WHO HAVE EDUCABLE MENTALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN?

In order to obtain a descriptive picture of the structure of attitude patterns of the population toward general as well as specific child-rearing practices, the category scores at initial testing for the PARI and AMR were compiled for the total study population.

General Attitudes Toward Child-Rearing Practices

Tables 9, 10, and 11 present a rank ordering of the PARI categories according to the summated scores for the entire group and for men and women subjects separately.

The results for the total group (Table 9) showed that the five categories which received the highest scores were; 16 - Comradeship and Sharing (1454), 18 - Autonomy of Child (1447), 17 - Expression of Affection (1407), 11 - Equalitarianism (1368), and 1 - Encouraging Verbalization (1359). The five categories which ranked the lowest were; 3 - Seclusiveness (899), 10 - Suppression of Aggression (889), 4 - Breaking the Will (887), 2 - Fostering Dependency (887), and 14 - Suppression of Sexuality (808).

TABLE 9

DISTRIBUTION OF PARI SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION AT INITIAL TESTING[1]

Rank Order[2]	No.	Categories	Σ X
1	16.	Comradeship and Sharing	1454
2	18.	Autonomy of Child	1447
3	17.	Expression of Affection	1407
4	11.	Equalitarianism	1368
5	1.	Encouraging Verbalization	1359
6	5.	Marital Conflict	1260
7	7.	Irritability	1147
8	6.	Strictness	1133
9	19.	Achievement	1082
10	9.	Deification of Parent	1057
11	13.	Inconsiderateness	1042
12	8.	Excluding Outside Influences	960
13	15.	Ascendancy	937
14	12.	Avoidance of Communication	908
15	3.	Seclusiveness	899
16	10.	Suppression of Aggression	889
17.5	4.	Breaking the Will	887
17.5	2.	Fostering Dependency	887
19	14.	Suppression of Sexuality	808

N=85

[1] Raw Scores of 850+ are above the cut-off between negative and positive responses.

[2] Ordered from the highest positive category score downward.

An analysis of the high rank order scores reflects attitudes which are related to positive achievement and interaction patterns between parent and child. The emphasis is on permitting the child to express himself as a contributing member of the family. The low rank scores, which indicate negative orientation, suggest that the parents do not want to overprotect and restrict their children. This tends to reinforce the patterns which were previously observed among the high rank scores. Also, the parents do not wish to limit their activities to the home exclusively, but recognize the importance of maintaining social and community relationships.

The results of the father sub-group (Table 10) showed high rank scores for; 16 - Comradeship and Sharing (573), 11 - Equalitarianism (562), 1 - Encouraging Verbalization (561), 18 - Autonomy of Child (560), and 5 - Marital Conflict (523). The low rank scores were; 12 - Avoidance of Communication (376), 24 - Irresponsibility of the Father (368), 21 - Deception (359), 10 - Suppression of Aggression (350), 14 - Suppression of Sexuality (340), and 22 - Non-Punishment (315).

TABLE 10

DISTRIBUTION OF PARI SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE FATHER STUDY POPULATION AT INITIAL TESTING[1]

Rank Order[2]	No.	Categories	ΣX
1	16.	Comradeship and Sharing	573
2	11.	Equalitarianism	562
3	1.	Encouraging Verbalization	561
4	18.	Autonomy of Child	560
5	5.	Marital Conflict	523
6	17.	Expression of Affection	496

TABLE 10 CONTINUED

Rank Order[2]	No.	Categories	ΣX
7	19.	Achievement	479
8	6.	Strictness	466
9	29.	Forcing Independence	447
10.5	23.	Demanding Activity	446
10.5	30.	Past Orientation	446
12	7.	Irritability	445
13	13.	Inconsiderateness	444
14	28.	Change Orientation	434
15	27.	Suppression of Affection	431
16	9.	Deification of Parent	424
17.5	26.	Complaint of Ascendancy of Wife	404
17.5	8.	Excluding Outside Influences	404
19	4.	Breaking the Will	402
20.5	2.	Fostering Dependency	397
20.5	20.	Harsh Punishment	397
22	15.	Ascendancy	395
23	25.	Avoidance of Expression of Affection	382
24	3.	Seclusiveness	376
25.5	12.	Avoidance of Communication	368
25.5	24.	Irresponsibility of Father	368
27	21.	Deception	359

TABLE 10 CONTINUED

Rank Order[2]	No.	Categories	ΣX
28	10.	Suppression of Aggression	350
29	14.	Suppression of Sexuality	340
30	22.	Non-Punishment	315

N = 35

[1] Raw Scores of 350+ are above the cut-off between negative and positive responses.

[2] Ordered from the highest category score downward.

The fathers tend generally to exhibit the same positive patterns as those noted for the total group. In addition, the fathers recognize the inevitability of marital conflict as a positive factor of family life. The negative aspects suggest that they are concerned with their home roles as integrative rather than disintegrative. They seem to want their children to express themselves aggressively in order to maintain their individuality.

The findings from the mother sub-group (Table 11) demonstrated high rank scores for; 17 - Expression of Affection (911), 18 - Autonomy of Child (887), 16 - Comradeship and Sharing (881), 11 - Equalitarianism (806), and 1 - Encouraging Verbalization (798). The low rank scores were; 3 - Seclusiveness of the Mother (523), 2 - Fostering Dependency (490), 4 - Breaking the Will (485), 14 - Suppression of Sexuality (468) and 20 - Martyrdom (463). The patterns which the mothers exhibit closely parallel the fathers.

TABLE 11

DISTRIBUTION OF PARI SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE MOTHER STUDY POPULATION AT INITIAL TESTING[1]

Rank Order[2]	No.	Categories	ΣX
1	17.	Expression of Affection	911
2	18.	Autonomy of Child	887
3	16.	Comradeship and Sharing	881
4	11.	Equalitarianism	806
5	1.	Encouraging Verbalization	798
6	5.	Marital Conflict	737
7	7.	Irritability	702
8	19.	Achievement	670
9	6.	Strictness	667
10	23.	Approval of Activity	649
11	21.	Fear of Harming the Baby	635
12	9.	Deification of Parent	633
13	22.	Rejection of Homemaking Role	601
14	13.	Inconsiderateness of the Husband	598
15	26.	Dependency of Mother	595
16	15.	Ascendancy of the Mother	582
17	25.	Acceleration of Development	581
18	8.	Excluding Outside Influences	556
19	12.	Avoidance of Communication	540
20	10.	Suppression of Aggression	539

TABLE 11 CONTINUED

Rank Order[2]	No.	Categories	ΣX
21	24.	Intrusiveness	528
22	3.	Seclusiveness of the Mother	523
23	2.	Fostering Dependency	490
24	4.	Breaking the Will	485
25	14.	Suppression of Sexuality	468
26	20.	Martyrdom	463

N = 5-

[1] Raw Scores of 500+ are above the cut-off between negative and positive responses.

[2] Ordered from the highest positive category score downward.

The general attitudes of the parents reflect a cohesiveness in the philosophy of child-rearing practices. Their roles are clearly delineated in being constructive, realistic, and functional members in the home and community. There is little evidence that they desire to withdraw from the community or superimpose an over-protective, highly emotionalized environment in the home.

Attitudes Towards Mental Retardation

The summated scores of the AMR are presented in Tables 12, 13, and 14 for the total group and for men and women subjects separately.

The categories with the high rank scores for the total group (Table 12) were; 17 - Expression of Affection (1576), 24 - Comradeship and Sharing (1524), 28 - Autonomy of Child (1519), 19- Encouraging Verbalization (1477) and 11 - Equalitarianism (1382). The low rank scores were; 1 - Sexuality (626), 14 - Educational Implications and Treatment (594), 15 - Community Provision (580), 3 - Appearance (457) and 2 - Genetic Responsibility (438).

TABLE 12

DISTRIBUTION OF AMR SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION ON INITIAL TESTING[1]

Rank order[2]	No.	Categories	ΣX
1	17.	Expression of Affection	1576
2	24.	Comradeship and Sharing	1524
3	28.	Autonomy of Child	1519
4	19.	Encouraging Verbalization	1477
5	29.	Equalitarianism	1382
6	13.	Counteraction: Re-striving	1179
7	6.	Independency	1157
8	33.	Achievement	1128
9	27.	Irritability	1121
10	30.	Approval of Activity	1107
11	23.	Deification	1090
12	4.	Normalcy of Development	1057
13	25.	Strictness	1055
14	32.	Acceleration of Development	990
15	31.	Fostering Dependency	968
16	22.	Suppression of Aggression	919
17	20.	Excluding Outside Influences	916
18	9.	Peer Interaction	910
19	21.	Avoidance of Communication	856
20	26.	Breaking the Will	826

TABLE 12 CONTINUED

Rank Order[2]	No.	Categories	ΣX
21	10.	Concept of Retardation	822
22	7.	Aggression	802
23	18.	Suppression of Sexuality	762
24	5.	Dependency	735
25	12.	Comprehension of Self/Others	696
26	16.	Emotional-Social Behavior	681
27	11.	Abasement	653
28	8.	Guilt	641
29	1.	Sexuality	626
30	14.	Educational Implications and Treatment	594
31	15.	Community Provision	580
32	3.	Appearance	457
33	2.	Genetic Responsibility	438

[1] Raw Scores of 850+ are above the cut-off between negative and positive responses.

[2] Ordered from the highest category score downward.

The positive patterns demonstrated by the total group indicate interactive relationships between parent and child which allow the latter to express himself as an individual who can enhance the home environment. The negative indices purposively suggest the intensification of retardation upon the lives of the parents. The predominant concerns are in the areas of sexual relationships, education, and social placement, and the rejection of the child because he is retarded.

The categories which the fathers (Table 13) ranked highest were; 17 - Expression of Affection (627), 24 - Comradeship and Sharing (614), 28 - Autonomy of Child (600), 19- Encouraging Verbalization (596) and 29 - Equalitarianism (596). The lowest ranked categories were; 1 - Sexuality (270), 15 - Community Provision (265), 14 - Educational Implications and Treatment (259), 3 - Appearance (208) and 2 - Genetic Responsibility (196).

TABLE 13

DISTRIBUTION OF AMR SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE FATHER STUDY POPULATION ON INITIAL TESTING[1]

Rank Order[2]	No. Categories	ΣX
1	17. Expression of Affection	627
2	24. Comradeship and Sharing	614
3	28. Autonomy of Child	600
4	19. Encouraging Verbalization	596
5	29. Equalitarianism	556
6	13. Counteraction: Re-striving	528
7	6. Independency	524
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
9	4. Normalcy of Development	464
10	30. Approval of Activity	458
11	23. Deification	457
12	27. Irritability	455
13	32. Acceleration of Development	425
14	25. Strictness	419
15	9. Peer Interaction	412

TABLE 13 CONTINUED

Rank Order[2]	No.	Categories	ΣX
16	31.	Fostering Dependency	410
17	20.	Excluding Outside Influences	380
18	22.	Suppression of Aggression	365
19	10.	Concept of Retardation	358
20	7.	Aggression	354
21	21.	Avoidance of Communication	348
22	26.	Breaking the Will	333
23	5.	Dependency	325
24	16.	Emotional-Social Behavior	311
25	18.	Suppression of Sexuality	300
26	12.	Comprehension of Self/Others	297
27	8.	Guilt	290
28	11.	Abasement	285
29	1.	Sexuality	270
30	15.	Community Provision	265
31	14.	Educational Implications and Treatment	259
32	3.	Appearance	208
33	2.	Genetic Responsibility	196

N = 35

[1] Raw Scores of 350+ are above the cut-off between negative and positive responses.

[2] Ordered from the highest category score downward.

The specific attitudes which fathers express are identical to those which the total group exhibit. The intensity of such patterns is unusually consistent.

Mothers (Table 14) tended to rank high on the following categories; 17 - Expression of Affection (949), 28 - Autonomy of Child (919), 24 - Comradeship and Sharing (910), 19- Encouraging Verbalization (881) and 29 - Equalitarianism (826). The lowest ranked categories were; 11 - Abasement (376), 15 - Community Provision (371), 8 - Guilt (360), 3 - Appearance (299) and 2 - Genetic Responsibility (289).

TABLE 14

DISTRIBUTION OF AMR SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE MOTHER STUDY POPULATION ON INITIAL TESTING[1]

Rank Order[2]	No.	Categories	ΣX
1	17.	Expression of Affection	949
2	28.	Autonomy of Child	919
3	24.	Comradeship and Sharing	910
4	19.	Encouraging Verbalization	881
5	29.	Equalitarianism	826
6	13.	Counteraction: Re-striving	754
7	6.	Independency	734
8	27.	Irritability	666
9	4.	Normalcy of Development	662
10	33.	Achievement	659
11	30.	Approval of Activity	649
12	25.	Strictness	636

TABLE 14 CONTINUED

Rank Order^2	No.	Categories	ΣX
13	9.	Peer Interaction	591
14	32.	Acceleration of Development	565
15	23.	Deification	563
16	31.	Fostering Dependency	558
17	22.	Suppression of Aggression	554
18	10.	Concept of Retardation	545
19	20.	Excluding Outside Influences	536
20	7.	Aggression	516
21	21.	Avoidance of Communication	508
22	26.	Breaking the Will	493
23	5.	Dependency	484
24	12.	Comprehension of Self/Others	469
25	18.	Suppression of Sexuality	462
26	16.	Emotional-Social Behavior	459
27	1.	Sexuality	415
28	14.	Educational Implications and Treatment	387
29	11.	Abasement	376
30	15.	Community Provision	371
31	8.	Guilt	360
32	3.	Appearance	299
33	2.	Genetic Responsibility	289

N = 50

Raw Scores of 500+ are above the cut-off between negative and positive responses.

Ordered from the highest category score downward.

The patterns of maternal attitudes toward retardation express somewhat similar reactions to those of the father. For example, they refuse to accept the notion that either parent has a gene deficiency which may have been a causal factor in the procreation of a retardate. Furthermore, they indicate disapproval in areas, i.e., 1 - Sexuality, 14 - Educational Implications and Treatment, 15 - Community Provision and 3 - Appearance, which emphasize the rejective aspects within the environment toward the retardate.

As a subsequent question (12) will consider in detail the differences between expressed general child-rearing attitudes and attitudes toward retardation as measured by parallel items on the PARI and AMR for each of the treatment groups, only a general comment will be made on the more diffuse data presented here. Generally the parents express stronger positive opinions to items on the AMR than to the generalized parallel items on the PARI. Obviously the specific reference to retardation in the AMR items elicits this more pronounced response in such areas as 17 - Expression of Affection, 24 - Comradeship and Sharing, 28 - Autonomy of Child, 19- Encouraging Verbalization, and 29 - Equalitarianism. This seems to indicate a trend for these parents of the educable mentally handicapped to react more strongly on items specifically referring to retardation which encompass aspects of achievement, opportunities for self expression, and increased parental contact with the retardate. The parents, by their responses, seem to be more flexible and lenient in their expression of attitudes toward the retardate and toward each other.

The constancy of general and specific attitudes for the highest ranked scores over both instruments indicates a consistent expression of child-rearing practices. The importance of this finding becomes significant when it is recognized that on the AMR the parent has a greater field of items in which to select their predominant attitudes. It is conceivable that these attitudes are more internalized and may represent reliable expressions of attitude structure.

QUESTION 2. WHAT IS THE PATTERN OF FAMILIAL ADJUSTMENT OF PARENTS OF EDUCABLE MENTALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN?

An index of the familial adjustment was obtained from the DRQ scores on the interview data for all subjects who were interviewed (Tables 15, 16, 17). The distribution of the summated scores for the total group is presented in Table 15. They were ranked from highest to lowest in the following order; 4 - Community (8909), 3 - Activity-Goals (7023), 1 - Intra-Family (6807), 2 - Neighborhood (5559) and 5 - Parental Relationships (5513).

TABLE 15

DISTRIBUTION OF DRQ SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE
STUDY POPULATION ON INITIAL TESTING

Rank Order*	No.	Categories	ΣX
1	4.	Community	8909
2	3.	Activity-Goals	7023
3	1.	Intra-Family	6807
4	2.	Neighborhood	5559
5	5.	Parental Relationships	5513

N = 137
*Ordered from the highest category score downward.

Greater relief, or adjustment, is shown by the total group in areas that relate to (1) a history of the recognition of retardation and a reconciliation to the handicap and (2) the parents' satisfaction with educational and organized activities-goals. Somewhat less relief is indicated in the reaction toward the retardate by the neighbors and peers; intra-familial relationships which concern disciplinary measures, special considerations and relationship between the retardate and his siblings;

and parental relationships that pertain to social life and the placing of blame for the retardation. In general, the category scores range downward from those of a more outer-directed nature toward the more personalized facets of familial adjustment.

The findings which were obtained for the father sub-group (Table 16) were; 4 - Community (4002), 3 - Activity-Goals (3001), 1 - Intra-Family (2897), 2 - Neighborhood (2318) and 5 - Parental Relationships (2207). Fathers tend to show the same pattern and order of adjustment as the total group.

TABLE 16

DISTRIBUTION OF DRQ SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE FATHER STUDY POPULATION ON INITIAL TESTING

Rank Order*	No. Categories	ΣX
1	4. Community	4002
2	3. Activity-Goals	3001
3	1. Intra-Family	2897
4	2. Neighborhood	2318
5	5. Parental Relationships	2207

N = 63

*Ordered from the highest category score downward.

The female sub-group (Table 17) presented a somewhat similar ranking as that shown by the total group and male sub-group comparison with the exception that the order of 2 - Neighborhood and 5 - Parental Relationships is reversed: 4 - Community (4907), 3 - Activity-Goals (3992), 1 - Intra-Family (3810), 5 - Parental Relationships (3306) and 2 - Neighborhood (3241).

TABLE 17

DISTRIBUTION OF DRQ SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE MOTHER STUDY POPULATION ON INITIAL TESTING

Rank Order*	No. Categories	ΣX
1	4. Community	4907
2	3. Activity-Goals	3992
3	1. Intra-Family	3810
4	5. Parental Relationships	3306
5	2. Neighborhood	3241

N = 74
*Ordered from the highest category score downward.

Although the major adjustive patterns of the mothers are similar to the total group and the male sub-group, they seem to perceive the neighborhood as a greater problem area of adjustment for themselves and their children. This may be brought about by their more regular and direct immediate contacts with neighborhood elements as they relate to the retardate, in contrast to the more incidental and less frequent nature of these experiences by the fathers.

The pattern of familial adjustment indicates a hierarchical ordering that is quite stable in that fairly large intervals exist between the five categories in most instances. The high relative position of the 4 - Community and 3 - Activity-Goals categories seems related to a more objective approach to the interpretation and conceptualization of problem areas. A parent can conceivably objectively relate the history of the retardation and associated community contacts and resources. Since these experiences are, for the most part, in the past rather than major areas of current concern, the retrospective approach can conceivably be more objectively treated than those areas which reflect immediate growing concern, such as interactions within the neighborhood. Similarly in the area of 3 - Activity-Goals, the parent can more easily relate school history, achievement, and progress from a fairly concrete and objective approach. Generally, the parents are somewhat better adjusted in areas where they have received some assistance or are at the moment securing help which clarifies parental expectations.

The categories 1 - Intra-Family, 5 - Parental Adjustment, and 2 - Neighborhood are interrelated on the basis of content and dynamics. The trend toward more personal conflict in these areas can be partially attributed to the fact that they delve into more personal, emotionalized, and immediate aspects of individual adjustment of the parent, child, and parent-child interactions. These aspects of behavior may represent the more frustrating and rejective elements of the environment. The resolution of these problems depends more upon the ego strength of the parent rather than the utilization of outside resources.

QUESTION 3. IS THERE SIGNIFICANT VARIABILITY WITHIN THE TOTAL POPULATION ON ANY OF THE INSTRUMENTS USED?

In order to determine the initial homogeneity of the study population on the various instruments as a basis for further data analysis and interpretation, an analysis of variance was performed on the initial testing session data for each category of each of the measures used for the total group and for men and women subjects separately.

Tables 18 through 86 present those specific category breakdowns for which significant differences were obtained. The data for all interactions tested (yielding both significant and non-significant differences) are presented in Appendix C.

A. Discomfort - Relief Quotient (DRQ)

Tables 18 through 21 report the significant differences found as a result of an analysis of variance treatment of the DRQ scores as they were derived from the interview data on each of the subjects subsequently contained in any one of the treatment groups.

For the total group, only one category, 2 - Neighborhood, yielded significant differences (Table 18). The obtained F of 2.04 was significant at the .05 level of probability. No further differences at the .01 or .10 levels were obtained.

TABLE 18

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON DRQ SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION (N=85)

Category 2 Neighborhood

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	761.82	95.23	8	2.04	**
Within	6246.60	46.62	134		
Total	7008.42		142		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less then the .01 level of probability

This difference may be due to the homogeneity of the sample in that while socio-economic and related factors were equated, individual neighborhood circumstances and relations could differ greatly. Although the total group came from metropolitan areas, the social structure and emotional atmosphere is quite dissimilar. New York City certainly differs from Syracuse and Schenectady, while the latter differ from either Binghamton or Rochester.

For the father population (Tables 19, 20, 21), the category relating to 5 - Parental Relationships yielded significant differences at the .01 level (Table 21). In two categories, Intra-Family and Activity-Goals, trends are noted as the obtained F values are significant only at the .10 level (Tables 19, 20). No differences at the .05 level were obtained.

TABLE 19

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON DRQ SCORES
FOR THE ENTIRE FATHER STUDY POPULATION (N=35)

Category 1 Intra-Family

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1260.68	157.59	8	2.02	*
Within	4600.75	77.98	59		
Total	5861.43		67		

TABLE 20

Category 3 Activity-Goals

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1714.74	214.34	8	1.99	*
Within	6346.06	107.56	59		
Total	8060.80	321.90	67		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 21

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON DRQ SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE FATHER STUDY POPULATION (N=35) (CONT)

Category 5 Parental Relationships

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	4439.77	554.97	8	3.16	***
Within	10356.50	175.53	59		
Total	14796.27		67		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

The fathers show significant variability in social interests and intra-relationships. Part of the explanation for this variance may be due to differences within each community. It follows that the effect upon fathers would be significant since they are closely related to the attitudes of the community.

No significant differences within the defined levels were found in the treatment of the DRQ scores of the mother segment of the sample separately.

None of the three breakdowns show any unusual initial variability, beyond the limits of chance probability. Hence as far as DRQ scores are concerned, the total population seems to be fairly homogeneous. Why the female subjects show no variability in contrast to more pronounced trends for the male sub-group can perhaps be accounted for to some extent by the smaller sample size for the men. Furthermore, a greater tendency for men to react with more individuality and with lesser concern for socially acceptable behaviers may also be a contributory factor. Obviously, fathers seem to be more influenced by community attitudes than mothers. Yet, in the total group analysis, both are to some degree affected by the neighborhood.

B. Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI)

Tables 22 through 40 present the significant differences found by analysis of variance treatment of the study population on PARI scores for the initial test session.

For the total group (Tables 22 through 28) 7 of the 19 categories showed significant variability at the .01 or .05 level. They were; 1 - Encouraging Verbalization (.01), 10 - Suppression of Aggression (.05), 11 - Equalitarianism (.01), 14 - Suppression of Sexuality (.05), 16 - Comradeship and Sharing (.05), 17 - Expression of Affection (.05) and 18 - Autonomy of the Child (.01). No trends were noted at the .10 level.

TABLE 22

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON PARI SCORES FOR
THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION (TOTAL GROUP N=85)

Category 1 Encouraging Verbalization

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	31.56	4.51	7	4.03	***
Within	92.94	1.12	83		
Total	124.50		90		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 23

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON PARI SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION (TOTAL GROUP N=85) (CONT)

Category 10 Suppression of Aggression

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	10.24	1.46	7	2.12	**
Within	57.15	.69	83		
Total	67.39		90		

TABLE 24

Category 11 Equalitarianism

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	19.09	2.73	7	3.10	***
Within	73.07	.88	83		
Total	92.16		90		

TABLE 25

Category 14 Suppression of Sexuality

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	13.25	1.89	7	2.40	**
Within	65.82	.79	83		
Total	79.07		90		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 26

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON PARI SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION (TOTAL GROUP N=85) (CONT)

Category 16 Comradeship and Sharing

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	19.97	2.85	7	2.16	**
Within	109.64	1.32	83		
Total	129.61		90		

TABLE 27

Category 17 Expression of Affection

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	23.80	3.40	7	2.17	**
Within	130.69	1.57	83		
Total	154.49		90		

TABLE 28

Category 18 Autonomy of the Child

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	21.34	3.05	7	2.96	***
Within	85.65	1.03	83		
Total	106.99		90		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

Major variability seems to exist in areas which relate to encouraging independent expression and support, parental enjoyment of the child and avoiding physical acts to enforce control. These patterns are directly related to child-rearing philosophy and practices in contrast to those categories concerned with patterns of parental adjustment and behavior.

The father sub-group (Tables 29 through 36) showed significant differences at the .05 or .01 level in only 5 of the 30 categories; 1 - Encouraging Verbalization (.05), 7 - Irritability (.05), 14 - Suppression of Sexuality (.01), 20 - Harsh Punishment (.04), and 24 - Irresponsibility of Father (.01). Indications of trends at the .10 level were noted in three additional categories; 12 - Avoidance of Communication, 16 - Comradeship and Sharing, and 26 - Complaint of Ascendancy of Wife.

TABLE 29

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON PARI SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION (FATHERS N=35)

Category 1 Encouraging Verbalization

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	38.08	5.44	7	2.82	**
Within	61.71	1.93	32		
Total	99.79		39		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 30

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON PARI SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION (FATHERS N=35) (CONT)

Category 7 Irritability

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	26.56	3.79	7	2.92	**
Within	41.52	1.30	32		
Total	68.08		39		

TABLE 31

Category 12 Avoidance of Communication

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	19.60	2.80	7	2.03	*
Within	44.04	1.38	32		
Total	63.64		39		

TABLE 32

Category 14 Suppression of Sexuality

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	26.31	3.76	7	3.55	***
Within	33.89	1.06	32		
Total	60.20		39		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 33

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON PARI SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION (FATHERS N=35) (CONT)

Category 16 Comradeship and Sharing

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	33.39	4.77	7	2.22	*
Within	68.66	2.15	32		
Total	102.05		39		

TABLE 34

Category 20 Harsh Punishment

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	27.68	3.95	7	2.52	**
Within	50.24	1.57	32		
Total	77.92		39		

TABLE 35

Category 24 Irresponsibility of Father

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	33.72	4.82	7	3.25	***
Within	47.36	1.48	32		
Total	81.08		39		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 36

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON PARI SCORES FOR
THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION (FATHERS N=35)
(CONT)

Category 26 Complaint of Ascendancy of Wife

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	23.94	3.42	7	1.92	*
Within	56.83	1.78	32		
Total	80.77		39		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

Demands upon the father and mother in enacting their parental roles in the home and the means for stimulating the youngster rather than suppressing him seem to be the important areas of variability. Three of the areas, 7 - Irritability, 24 - Irresponsibility of Father, and 26 - Complaint of Ascendancy of Wife, are predominantly related to personal and/or marital adjustment of the parent while the other categories are more pertinent to child-rearing practices. Three of these categories, 20 - Harsh Punishment, 24 - Irresponsibility of Father, and 26 - Complaint of Ascendancy of Wife, which indicate initial variability for the fathers are topics which only appear on the father form and thus are not noted in the mother or the full group analysis.

Tables 37 through 40 present the significant differences found by analysis of variance of the scores of the female sub-group on initial PARI scores. In two instances, categores 6 - Strictness and 19 - Achievement, existing variability was found to be significant at the .05 level. In the additional categories, 9 - Deification of Parent and 11 - Equalitarianism, significant trends were obtained at the .10 level. No differences at the .01 level were obtained.

TABLE 37

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON PARI SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION (MOTHERS N=50)

Category 6 Strictness

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	41.29	5.90	7	2.32	**
Within	109.34	2.54	43		
Total	150.63		50		

TABLE 38

Category 9 Deification of Parent

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	50.67	7.24	7	2.22	*
Within	140.10	3.26	43		
Total	190.77		50		

TABLE 39

Category 11 Equalitarianism

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	39.06	5.58	7	2.11	*
Within	113.89	2.65	43		
Total	152.95		50		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 40

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON PARI SCORES
FOR THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION (MOTHERS N=50)

Category 19 Achievement

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	130.29	18.61	7	2.77	**
Within	288.75	6.72	43		
Total	419.04		50		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

The focus of content centers around child-rearing practices and goals. The primary relationships include the need for strictness to develop a happier child, but to recognize the reciprocal interactions between parent and child.

The total population does not appear to be homogeneous in some areas related to child-rearing practices. Variability within the mother and father sub-groups is not shown on any of the same categories. In addition to reaching significance on more variables than the mothers, the fathers seem to display this variation on more topics of personal concern. Both these patterns are fairly consistent with the findings of the preceding analysis of DRQ scores. However, it should also be kept in mind that the father form consists of more sub-scales (30) than the mother form (26), a factor which might account for additional latitude of variability.

C. Attitude Scale Toward Mental Retardation (AMR)

Initial significant differences among the study population on AMR items were found for two of the 33 categories: 6 - Independence and 9 - Poor Interaction (Tables 41 and 42). Both were significant at the .01 level of probability. No additional categories approached significance at either the .05 or the .10 level.

TABLE 41

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON AMR SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION (TOTAL GROUP N=85)

Category 6 Independency

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	26.83	3.83	7	5.25	***
Within	60.27	.73	83		
Total	87.10		90		

TABLE 42

Category 9 Peer Interaction

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	34.50	4.93	7	3.29	***
Within	124.60	1.50	83		
Total	159.10		90		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

Both these significant categories are related in content to the parents' concept of the social potential of the retardate. They are concerned with the ability of the retardate to activate and sustain activity in social relationships with peers and authority figures.

The father sub-group, again on this instrument, exhibited the trend toward more variability. As for the total group, two categories, 6 - Independency and 9 - Peer Interaction, were significant at the .01 level (Tables 44, 45). In five additional categories trends were noted inasmuch as significance was reached at the .10 level: 5 - Dependency, 17 - Expression of Affection, 18 - Suppression of Sexuality, 20 - Excluding

Outside Influences, and 21 - Avoidance of Communication (Tables 43, 46-49).

TABLE 43

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON AMR SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION (FATHERS N=35)

Category 5 Dependency

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	56.95	8.14	7	2.26	*
Within	115.30	3.60	32		
Total	172.25		39		

TABLE 44

Category 6 Independency

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	34.08	4.87	7	3.33	***
Within	46.85	1.46	32		
Total	80.93		39		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 45

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON AMR SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION (FATHERS N=35) (CONT)

Category 9 Peer Interaction

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	43.97	6.28	7	2.48	***
Within	80.98	2.53	32		
Total	124.95		39		

TABLE 46

Category 17 Expression of Affection

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	11.05	1.58	7	2.13	*
Within	23.64	.74	32		
Total	34.69		39		

TABLE 47

Category 18 Suppression of Sex

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	16.25	2.32	7	2.00	*
Within	37.23	1.16	32		
Total	53.48		39		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 48

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON AMR SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION (FATHERS N=35) (CONT)

Category 20 Excluding Outside Influences

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	30.80	4.40	7	2.16	*
Within	65.17	2.04	32		
Total	95.97		39		

TABLE 49

Category 21 Avoidance of Communication

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	21.06	3.01	7	2.18	*
Within	44.07	1.38	32		
Total	65.13		39		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

The fathers, quite similarly to the total group, are concerned with the social interrelationships of the retardate. The majority of these five additional categories are also related to both the social functioning of the retardate and means and/or principles for the parent in preventing or coping with problem areas.

The mother sub-group showed significance in initial variability on three AMR categories; 23 - Deification and 33 - Achievement, at the .05 level (Tables 50 and 52); and 25 - Strictness at the .01 level (Table 51). No differences at the .01 level were obtained.

TABLE 50

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON AMR SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION (MOTHERS N=50)

Category 23 Deification

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	52.28	7.47	7	2.42	*
Within	132.78	3.09	43		
Total	185.06		50		

TABLE 51

Category 25 Strictness

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	57.49	8.21	7	3.42	***
Within	103.34	2.40	43		
Total	160.83		50		

TABLE 52

Category 33 Achievement

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	105.46	15.07	7	2.61	**
Within	247.93	5.77	43		
Total	353.39		50		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

The appearance of 23 - Deification and 25 - Strictness as significant categories evidently indicates unusual variability among the mothers in terms of their concept of themselves and their role in relationship to the retardate's behavior and adjustment. The variability for 33 - Achievement might also indicate an interest as to the goals and the means of achieving them through control and discipline. In a sense, these categories reflect the maternal concept of role and suitable behavior in the training of the retarded child.

The total group seems to exhibit homogeneity of variance for specific attitudes toward retardation. While the fathers do not show any significant initial variability, the mothers do. This is a reversal of the patterns noted for the DRQ and the PARI. It appears that mothers tend to be less homogeneous in specific attitudes than general attitudes or familial adjustment. The impact of retardation may be more keenly felt.

There seems to be a consistency for the group and two sex sub-groups in terms of the major areas of variation on the DRQ, the PARI and the AMR. The mother sub-group exhibits a fairly consistent tendency to be more variable on personally oriented items even when confined to references to a child, children or child-rearing. The fathers differ more predominantly on items pertinent to practices.

D. Gradient Sentence Completion (GSC)

(1) Category Variable Scores

Initial variability on GSC Variable scores for the sample was found at either the .01 or the .05 level for four of the 35 category variables: 2 - Achievement (.01), 4 - Acquisition (.01), 19 - Nurturance (.05) and 21 - Optimism (.05)(Tables 53 - 56). Significance at the .10 level was also noted for one variable, 31 - Submissiveness (Table 57).

TABLE 53

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION (TOTAL GROUP N=85)

Category 2 Achievement

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	73.61	10.52	7	3.41	***
Within	255.83	3.08	83		
Total	329.44		90		

TABLE 54

Category 4 Acquisition

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	10.79	1.54	7	3.21	***
Within	39.63	.48	83		
Total	50.42		90		

TABLE 55

Category 19 Nurturance

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	46.24	6.61	7	2.50	**
Within	218.73	2.64	83		
Total	264.97		90		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability

**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability

***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 56

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION (TOTAL GROUP N=85) (CONT)

Category 21 Optimism

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	2.00	.29	7	2.20	**
Within	11.01	.13	83		
Total	13.01		90		

TABLE 57

Category 31 Submissiveness

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.57	.22	7	2.04	*
Within	9.47	.11	83		
Total	11.04		90		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

The four variables displaying major variability are essentially related to aspects of behavior concerned with significant, personal and material achievement goals. The subjects vary in their indications of need fulfillment in these expressive modes. The parents seem to have ambivalence and unfulfillment in terms of their expectations and actual realization of goals both in terms of personal gratification through their own parental role behavior toward the retardate (Nurturance), and in terms of actual achievement, either of a material (Acquisition) or a growth manifestation (Achievement). The variation on 21 - Optimism is also related to the emotional tone of the response to goal expectations and realization.

The father sub-group showed significant initial variation on three of the variables: 4 - Acquisition (.01), 27 - Rejection (.05) and 34 - Understanding (.05)(Tables 58, 59, 61). Significance at the .10 level was also found for category variable 28 - Seclusion (Table 60).

TABLE 58

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION (FATHERS N=35)

Category 4 Acquisition

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	33.31	4.76	7	5.60	***
Within	27.28	.85	32		
Total	60.59		39		

TABLE 59

Category 27 Rejection

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	40.50	5.79	7	2.74	**
Within	67.38	2.11	32		
Total	107.88		39		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 60

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION (FATHERS N=35) (CONT)

Category 28 Seclusion

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.18	.17	7	2.11	*
Within	2.55	.08	32		
Total	3.73		39		

TABLE 61

Category 34 Understanding

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	27.17	3.88	7	2.41	**
Within	51.36	1.61	32		
Total	78.53		39		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

The fathers in the study population tend to exhibit variation in a rather uncohesive pattern. Diversity within this sub-group on the 4 - Acquisition variable seems to reflect the material achievement need also noted for the total population. Inconsistency for the group seems to exist in the degree or level of understanding of behavior present in the group. It is possible that a segment of the fathers react dogmatically to certain situations, whereas others tend to use the more insightful approach. A portion of this sub-group also tends to refuse to respond to certain items or to reject stems. This behavior may also be related to the dynamic set of the males. If a stem suggests an inconsistency with one's thinking and/or is emotionally upsetting, it is rejected by some respondents.

The mother sub-group exhibited statistically significant initial variability on eight of the 35 category variables: 2 - Achievement (.01), 5 - Affiliation (.05), 7 - Autonomy (.01), 10 - Counteraction (.01), 12 - Description (.05), 14 - Identification (.01), 22 - Order (.01) and 31 - Submissiveness (.01)(Tables 62 - 69). No additional trends were noted at the .10 level.

TABLE 62

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES
FOR THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION (MOTHERS N=50)

Category 2 Achievement

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	325.70	46.53	7	5.80	***
Within	344.99	8.02	43		
Total	670.69		50		

TABLE 63

Category 5 Affiliation

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	195.83	27.98	7	2.67	**
Within	451.18	10.49	43		
Total	647.01		50		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 64

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION (MOTHERS N=50)
(CONT)

Category 7 Autonomy

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	216.34	30.91	7	27.11	***
Within	49.11	1.14	43		
Total	265.45		50		

TABLE 65

Category 10 Counteraction

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	202.88	28.98	7	115.93	***
Within	10.64	.25	43		
Total	213.52		50		

TABLE 66

Category 12 Description

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	35.65	5.09	7	2.85	**
Within	77.09	1.79	43		
Total	112.74		50		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 67

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION (MOTHERS N=50) (CONT)

Category 14 Identification

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	25.79	3.68	7	4.28	***
Within	36.98	.86	43		
Total	62.77		50		

TABLE 68

Category 22 Order

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	24.73	3.53	7	3.64	***
Within	41.50	.97	43		
Total	66.23		50		

TABLE 69

Category 31 Submissiveness

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	8.33	1.19	7	3.72	***
Within	13.90	.32	43		
Total	22.23		50		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

The mother sub-group shows inconsistent patterns on topics related to factual descriptions, achievement needs, patterns of control and interaction, and self-identification. The appearance of the more personalized aspects such as 5 - Affiliation and 14 - Identification might be assumed for the females. The maternal role frequently involves greater attention to the individualized aspects of these patterns of behavior. The greater occurrence of differences for the mothers in contrast to the fathers and the total group seems to be essentially related to this factor. The greater subjectivity and emotional tone responses which the GSC elicits probably account for the increased variability in the mother sub-group.

(2) Category Direction Scores

No significant differences at any level were found for the full population sample nor either of the sex sub-groups on Category Direction Scores from the GSC. This would tend to indicate homogeneity within the sample on these initial scores. The population shows a basic initial consistency in the acceptability of the response patterns which they indicate.

The population shows consistent variation in need personality areas predominantly concerned with achievement expectations, goals and means of achieving them for the parents themselves and for their retarded child. Realistic goals and patterns are evidently not well formulated or accepted by all parents of the retarded. The mothers show more variation and that of a more personalized nature concerned with self-oriented and personal interaction topics. The total group and the fathers tend to vary most on topics related to achievement goals and their reaction to certain situations. This diverse pattern may be due to the characteristics of the GSC which is designed to elicit greater subjective and emotional tone responses. Characteristically, more frequent and insightful patterns are obtained from the mothers.

The occurrence of significant initial variability on GSC Variable scores for the total study population is at a level beyond that attributable to chance alone. It is thus assumed that the population shows some initial patterns of heterogeneity on need personality variables measured by the GSC. Since the population exhibits a consistent pattern of direction orientation on GSC Direction scores, differences within the group are limited to the specific dynamic areas and are not related to the basic orientation of acceptability--non-acceptability.

E. Stern Activities Index (SAI)

Only two categories, 10 - Order (Table 71) and 19 - Affiliation (Table 74) of the 40 personality variables measured by the Stern Activities Index, showed statistically significant variation within the sample population at the .01 level. No categories reached statistical significance at the .05 level. Significance was reached at the .10 level for four additional categories; 7 - Adaptiveness, 11 - Harmavoidance, 15 - Reflectiveness, and 20 - Nurturance (Tables 70, 72, 73, 75).

TABLE 70

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON SAI SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION (TOTAL GROUP N=85)

Category 7 Adaptiveness

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	5.23	.75	7	2.08	*
Within	30.04	.36	83		
Total	35.27		90		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 71

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON SAI SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION (TOTAL GROUP N=85) (CONT)

Category 10 Order

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	13.61	1.94	7	3.19	***
Within	50.96	.61	83		
Total	64.57		90		

TABLE 72

Category 11 Harmavoidance

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	6.21	.89	7	2.02	*
Within	36.43	.44	83		
Total	42.64		90		

TABLE 73

Category 15 Reflectiveness

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	7.11	1.02	7	2.03	*
Within	41.54	.50	83		
Total	48.65		90		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 74

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON SAI SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION (TOTAL GROUP N=85) (CONT)

Category 19 Affiliation

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	8.78	1.25	7	2.99	***
Within	35.10	.42	83		
Total	43.88		90		

TABLE 75

Category 20 Nurturance

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	3.17	.45	7	1.97	*
Within	19.12	.23	83		
Total	22.29		90		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

The parents of the educable mentally handicapped in the study population tend to show individual differences in their need for and expression of patterns of control and organization of their environment and their need for associations with other individuals. Indications of different patterns of protection of themselves and others, and personal reflectiveness are also apparent.

The male sub-group showed significant initial variation on three of the 40 SAI categories; 19 - Affiliation (.01), 34 - Rejection (.05), 35 - Autonomy (.05)(Tables 80-82). Trends toward significance at the .10 level were noted on four categories; 5 - Energy, 10 - Order, 12 - Understanding, and 17 - Scientism (Tables 76-79).

TABLE 76

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON SAI SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION (FATHERS N=35)

Category 5 Energy

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	5.88	.84	7	2.00	*
Within	13.31	.42	32		
Total	19.19		39		

TABLE 77

Category 10 Order

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	20.03	2.86	7	2.06	*
Within	44.40	1.39	32		
Total	64.43		39		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 78

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON SAI SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION (FATHERS N=35) (CONT)

Category 12 Understanding

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	13.17	1.88	7	2.07	*
Within	28.96	.91	32		
Total	42.13		39		

TABLE 79

Category 17 Scientism

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	24.09	3.44	7	2.16	*
Within	50.81	1.59	32		
Total	74.90		39		

TABLE 80

Category 19 Affiliation

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	23.87	3.41	7	3.67	***
Within	29.84	.93	32		
Total	53.71		39		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 81

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON SAI SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION (FATHERS N=35) (CONT)

Category 34 Rejection

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	7.29	1.04	7	2.48	**
Within	13.47	.42	32		
Total	20.76		39		

TABLE 82

Category 35 Autonomy

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	8.84	1.26	7	2.53	
Within	16.01	.50	32		
Total	24.85		39		

** Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability

The fathers show concern in the establishment of personal relationships and expressions of individuality and independence. They display a tendency to reject certain ideas or situations. This may be a reflection of a male role associated tendency to be less expressively emotional. Specific areas in which tendencies are noted (Energy, Order, Understanding and Scientism) lend support to this assumption of intra-group conflict on the subjectivity-objectivity dichotomy.

The occurrence of variation maintains essentially the same frequency as that for the total group. The male subjects tend to show more irregularity in reaction to material and emotionalized structure or lack of it than that noted for the total group.

The female sub-group exhibited statistically significant variation at the .05 level in four categories; 13 - Counteraction, 14 - Achievement, 16 - Humanism, and 27 - Ego Achievement (Tables 83 - 86). No significance was obtained at the .01 or .10 levels.

TABLE 83

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON SAI SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION (MOTHERS N=50)

Category 13 Counteraction

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	13.27	1.90	7	2.31	**
Within	35.13	.82	43		
Total	48.40		50		

TABLE 84

Category 14 Achievement

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	19.62	2.80	7	2.38	**
Within	50.95	1.18	43		
Total	70.57		50		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 85

INITIAL SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON SAI SCORES FOR THE ENTIRE STUDY POPULATION (MOTHERS N=50) (CONT)

Category 16 Humanism

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	28.25	4.04	7	2.37	**
Within	72.91	1.70	43		
Total	101.16		50		

TABLE 86

Category 27 Ego Achievement

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	19.59	2.80	7	2.33	**
Within	51.45	1.20	43		
Total	71.04		50		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

The mothers tend to show a lack of initial consistency on topics related to their achievement goals and needs, both of a material and self-maintenance nature. They also tend to vary on the interactive element of 16 - Humanism, reflecting an insecurity as to appropriate interactive behavioral modes. Both these patterns in parents of the retarded can be associated to the particular stress inherent in the birth of a retarded youngster.

Although the frequency of significant intra-group variation is relatively consistent for the total group and both sex sub-groups, indications of initial intra-group differences on the SAI need personality patterns exist predominantly in patterns of personalized control and affiliative behaviors. The fathers display their primary divergence in expressions of individuality and independence in interactions whereas the mothers' variation occurs in the personal and material achievement oriented areas. The occurrence of variability extends beyond chance limits. This trend is relatively consistent in the total group and the two sex sub-groups.

In summary, slight indications of initial variability beyond the limits of chance probability at the .05 level are found within the total study population on the PARI and GSC variables. The lesser occurrence of intra-group variation on the AMR, DRQ, GSC Direction scores, and SAI reflects the selectivity of the population. It is difficult to explain precisely the initial homogeneity, or lack of it, on the basis of the content areas. It may be that parents of educable mentally handicapped children show greater variance on general attitudes toward child-rearing practices and certain aspects of need personality structure which relate to familial adjustment and retardation.

QUESTION 4. WHAT IS THE EFFECT OF COUNSELING UPON THE ATTITUDES AND NEED PERSONALITY STRUCTURE OF PARENTS WHO HAVE EDUCABLE MENTALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN?

The rationale for this question, as distinct from Question 5, is based upon the kinds of information which may accrue from analyzing each individual group over three test periods. Specifically, the data would provide a more precise picture of the counseling effects upon each group for the entire experimental period, rather than a breakdown at each testing period.

The data from each of the four clinic treatment groups (Cazenovia, Minnowbrook, Twice a Month and Once a Month) for each of the three testing sessions, and that from the Control group for the two test sets was separately tested by an analysis of variance for each category of each of the four major instruments. The groups are considered in the order of increasing time concentration: Cazenovia, Minnowbrook, Twice a Month, and Once a Month.

A. Cazenovia Group:

(1) Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI)

No statistically significant differences at any of the three levels were found over the three test administrations on any of the PARI categories for the total Cazenovia group or either of the sex sub-groups. The weekend counseling treatment does not seem to have effected a significant change in the pattern of attitudes toward child-rearing practices.

(2) Attitude Scale Toward Mental Retardation (AMR)

For the Cazenovia group, the analysis of variance over the three test administrations indicated significance in two of the 33 AMR categories: 3 - Appearance at the .05 level and 24 - Comradeship and Sharing at the .01 level (Tables 87 and 89). A tendency toward significance was noted in category 14 - Educational Implications and Treatment with significance being reached at the .10 level (Table 88).

TABLE 87

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE CAZENOVIA GROUP FOR THE AMR (N=12)

Category 3 Appearance

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	.07	.04	2	3.50	**
Within	.44	.01	33		
Total	.51		35		

TABLE 88

Category 14 Educational Implications and Treatment

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.73	.87	2	2.62	*
Within	10.91	.33	33		
Total	12.64		35		

TABLE 89

Category 24 Comradeship and Sharing

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	2.91	1.47	2	6.68	***
Within	7.35	.22	33		
Total	10.26		35		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

As these are not the same categories which show initial variability for the total experimental population in Question 3, it can be more readily assumed that differences are due to change and not to already existent variation among the subjects. The three categories displaying variation are all contextually related to the retardate, his behavior, future planning for his welfare, and parental handling aspects. Conceivably, some change in these specific aspects is brought about by the concentrated counseling treatment provided this group.

No significant differences were derived in the analysis of the father sub-group AMR data at any of the three levels. Since the male sub-group shows the greatest frequency of variation on the initial administration (Question 3), counseling may have effected change in that it diminished variation and made the group more homogeneous.

The female sub-group of the Cazenovia sample showed significance on two categories: 24 - Comradeship and Sharing (.01) and 28 - Autonomy of the Child (.05) (Tables 91, 92). Significance was also reached at the .19 level for Category 14 - Educational Implications and Treatment (Table 90).

TABLE 90

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE CAZENOVIA GROUP ON THE AMR (MOTHERS N=6)

Category 14 Educational Implications and Treatment

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	3.64	1.82	2	2.98	*
Within	9.22	.61	15		
Total	12.86		17		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 91

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE CAZENOVIA GROUP ON THE AMR (MOTHERS N=6) (CONT)

Category 24 Comradeship and Sharing

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	4.21	2.11	2	6.58	***
Within	4.77	.32	15		
Total	8.98		17		

TABLE 92

Category 28 Autonomy of Child

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	2.90	1.45	2	4.14	**
Within	.25	.35	15		
Total	3.15		17		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

There is a tendency in this group for major change to appear over the three administrations in areas concerned directly with the treatment, appearance and behavior of the retardate rather than parental reactions to retardation or areas considered more emotionally laden. Here again, those areas exhibiting overall variation are quite dissimilar from those initially identified as variant for the total study population, thus suggesting the reliability of these findings.

Evidently more significant change occurs in the mother than the father sub-population in areas containing specific reference to retardation.

It is conceivable that the fathers were made more homogeneous in view of their initial variability, whereas the mothers were made more heterogeneous.

It should also be noted that on the PARI categories which contain primary emphasis on attitudes toward children and child-rearing, no significant differences are noted as an overall effect of counseling treatment. However, some differences are found on the AMR which attempts to elicit specific reference to retardation in every item. It appears that counseling has been more effective in bringing about change in the Cazenovia group in specific attitude structure in contrast to those attitudes of a general nature.

(3) Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC)

(a) Category Variable Scores

On the analysis of variance for the 35 Gradient Sentence Completion variables, statistical significance was reached at the .05 level on two variables: 3 - Acquiescence and 17 - Irritability (Tables 93 and 95). No significant differences were noted at the .01 level. Category 11 - Deference also exhibited significance at the .10 level (Table 94).

TABLE 93

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE CAZENOVIA GROUP ON THE GSC VARIABLES (TOTAL N=12)

Category 3 Acquiescence

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	12.91	6.46	2	4.30	**
Within	49.61	1.50	33		
Total	62.52		35		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 94

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE CAZENOVIA GROUP ON THE GSC. VARIABLES (TOTAL N=12) (CONT)

Category 11 Deference

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	2.07	1.04	2	2.96	*
Within	11.44	.35	33		
Total	13.51		35		

TABLE 95

Category 17 Irritability

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.06	.53	2	3.31	**
Within	5.35	.16	33		
Total	6.41		35		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

The significant variables are closely related to the dynamics of personal adjustment of the parent. It appears that although the group is frustrated about their lives, they accept their roles passively. Here again, none of the three variables showing indications of change are among those exhibiting initial variation for the full population.

The Cazenovia male sub-group showed statistically significant change on the following category variables: 34 - Understanding (.01) and 24 - Phobia (.05) (Tables 98 and 99). Trends at the .10 level were also found in categories 3 and 17, Acquiescence and Irritability (Tables 96 and 97).

TABLE 96

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE CAZENOVIA GROUP ON THE GSC VARIABLES (FATHERS N=6)

Category 3 Acquiescence

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	12.57	6.29	2	3.40	*
Within	27.71	1.85	15		
Total	40.28		17		

TABLE 97

Category 17 Irritability

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	2.56	1.28	2	2.98	*
Within	6.50	.43	15		
Total	9.06		17		

TABLE 98

Category 24 Phobia

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	2.08	1.04	2	3.85	**
Within	4.08	.27	15		
Total	6.16		17		

TABLE 99

Category 34 Understanding

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	4.39	2.20	2	7.57	***
Within	4.36	.29	15		
Total	8.75		17		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

The significant categories in terms of overall change over the three test administrations are predominantly personally oriented in deference to goal directions and intellectually based content. Fear of activities and people, although expressed, are viewed alternately with compliance, understanding, and aggression. The predominant patterns seem to indicate a degree of understanding of the phobic components.

The female sub-population for the Cazenovia group did not reach statistical significance in terms of change on any of the need category variables included in the GSC at the .01 or .05 levels. However, trends at the .10 level were noted for two variables: 6 - Aggression and 7 - Autonomy (Tables 100 and 101).

TABLE 100

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST
ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE CAZENOVIA GROUP
ON THE GSC VARIABLES (MOTHERS N=6)

Category 6 Aggression

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	2.46	1.23	2	3.42	*
Within	5.36	.36	15		
Total	7.82		17		

TABLE 101

Category 7 Autonomy

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	2.36	1.18	2	3.47	*
Within	5.05	.34	15		
Total	7.41		17		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

This tendency for less change to take place in the female sub-group as contrasted to the males on GSC Variables is the reverse of that noted on the AMR. It would seem that the paucity of change by the females on the GSC and PARI items might be due to the more generalized orientation in contrast to the specific reference to retardation in the AMR scale. The paternal pattern of needs and attitudes more closely resembles the total group.

(b) Gradient Sentence Direction Scores

No significant differences on GSC direction scores were found through the analysis of variance treatment for the three sets of data on the Cazenovia clinic group.

(4) Stern Activities Index (SAI)

No significant differences at the .05 or .01 levels were found over the three test administrations of the SAI for the total Cazenovia group or either of the two sex sub-groups. Two indications of trends were noted at the .10 level, categories 6 - Pragmatism, for the total group and 24 - Dominance, for the female sub-group (Tables 102 and 103). The initial variability for the total population is not evident for the Cazenovia group because there is no change in pattern of scores on the SAI. Counseling tends to make this group more homogeneous.

TABLE 102

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST
ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE CAZENOVIA GROUP
ON THE SAI (TOTAL GROUP N=12)

Category 6 Pragmatism

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.50	.75	2	3.00	*
Within	8.40	.25	33		
Total	9.91		35		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 103

Category 24 Dominance

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	.67	.34	2	2.79	*
Within	1.75	.12	15		
Total	2.42		17		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

From consideration of the data on the Cazenovia group, it would appear that in most instances minimal change in attitude or need personality structure was brought about through the concentrated weekend counseling treatment. It must be noted that this analysis covers three sets of data from three testing periods: immediately preceding counseling, immediately following counseling and again after a 6-9 months time lapse during which no formal contact was maintained. From a subjective perusal of the raw data, it appears that in a number of categories some change which appeared on Test II scores tended to shift back on Test III over the no contact period. Perhaps more statistically significant change would have been found if this analysis had been done on Test I and Test II data alone. However, in the long run the staying effect of attitude change is a crucial consideration.

Generally change in the Cazenovia group is found most in more personally oriented areas and, in regard to retardation where reference to goals and handling of the child are concerned. Interesting sex differences appear in that the female sub-group shows comparatively more change on the AMR items which contain specific reference to retardation, whereas the males show more significant alteration in more personalized introspective and self-oriented areas tapped by the GSC. In addition, statistically significant change occurs without exception in categories in which initial variation for the entire test sample had not been found. This occurrence would tend to reinforce the significance of the obtained differences and suggest that perhaps in those initially variant categories the counseling procedure tends to foster homogeneity. This statement must be viewed with caution as the Cazenovia group constitutes only a portion of the total population.

B. Minnowbrook Group:

(1) Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI)

Statistical significance on the PARI items was found in only one instance, category 14 - Suppression of Sexuality (.01) for the Minnowbrook clinic group (Table 104). No differences at the .05 or .10 levels were found. This category is one of the seven for which initial variation had been found for the total study population in Question 3.

TABLE 104

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST
ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE MINNOWBROOK GROUP
ON THE PARI (N=21)

Category 14 Suppression of Sexuality

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	3.87	1.94	2	6.24	***
Within	18.76	.31	60		
Total	22.63		62		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

The same category, 14 - Suppression of Sexuality was the only one showing a significant trend (.10) for the father sub-group of the Minnowbrook population (Table 105). No differences appeared at the .01 or .05 levels. This category was also highly significant in terms of initial variation for the full male sub-population.

TABLE 105

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE MINNOWBROOK GROUP ON THE PARI (FATHERS N=7)

Category 14 Suppression of Sexuality

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	2.93	1.47	2	2.87	*
Within	9.22	.51	18		
Total	12.15		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

On the mother sub-group comparison, again category 14 - Suppression of Sexuality was the only variable yielding significance (.05) (Table 106). No differences occurred at the .01 or .10 levels. This category does not show initial variation for the full sample female population.

TABLE 106

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE MINNOWBROOK GROUP ON THE PARI (MOTHERS N=14)

Category 14 Supprersion of Sexuality

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	4.50	2.25	2	3.81	**
Within	23.04	.59	39		
Total	27.54		41		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

This minor occurrence of variation on PARI scores suggests minimal effect on attitudes relating to child-rearing practices as the result of the weekly counseling experience provided the Minnowbrook group. The interesting consistency of inhibiting the sexual curiosity of the retardate suggests the concern in this area which was reflected in the counseling sessions. This was one of the areas which the parents selected as a major topic of discussion.

(2) Attitude Scale Toward Mental Retardation (AMR)

Statistical significance over the three test administrations to test the overall effect of counseling was found in one category, 18 - Suppression of Sexuality, at the .01 level (Table 112) and at the .05 level on four categories: 12 - Comprehension of Self and Others, 14 - Educational Implications and Treatment, 15 - Community Provision, and 16 - Emotional-Social Behavior (Tables 108, 109, 110, 111). A significant trend at the .10 level was noted for category 1 - Sexuality (Table 107).

TABLE 107
SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST
ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE MINNOWBROOK GROUP
ON THE AMR (TOTAL N=21)

Category 1 Sexuality

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	2.29	1.15	2	3.01	*
Within	22.95	.38	60		
Total	25.24		62		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 108

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE MINNOWBROOK GROUP ON THE AMR (TOTAL N=21)

Category 12 Comprehension of Self/and Others

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	5.30	2.65	2	3.63	**
Within	43.69	.73	60		
Total	48.99		62		

TABLE 109

Category 14 Educational Implications and Treatment

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	4.11	2.06	2	4.47	**
Within	27.88	.46	60		
Total	31.99		62		

TABLE 110

Category 15 Community Provision

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	2.80	1.40	2	3.68	**
Within	22.97	.38	60		
Total	25.77		62		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 111

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE MINNOWBROOK GROUP ON THE AMR (TOTAL N=21)

Category 16 Emotional-Social Behavior

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	11.32	5.66	2	3.47	**
Within	97.68	1.63	60		
Total	109.00		62		

TABLE 112

Category 18 Suppression of Sexuality

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	3.04	1.52	2	5.85	***
Within	15.35	.26	60		
Total	18.39		62		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

These categories for which some change is noted are predominantly concerned with understanding the behavior of the retardate and provision for him rather than with goals or compensatory parental behavior. None of the categories noted show any initial variation. The frequency of significance for the Minnowbrook group on these items relating specifically to retardation is somewhat greater than that for the more time concentrated Cazenovia counseling group.

The Minnowbrook male sub-group showed statistical significance in three categories: 15 - Community Provision (.05), 16 - Emotional-Social

Behavior (.01), and 18 - Suppression of Sexuality (.01) (Tables 113, 114, 115). A trend at the .10 level was also found for category 24 - Comradeship and Sharing (Table 116).

TABLE 113

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST
ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE MINNOWBROOK GROUP
ON THE AMR (FATHERS N=7)

Category 15 Community Provision

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	9.49	4.75	2	5.27	**
Within	16.28	.90	18		
Total	25.77		20		

TABLE 114

Category 16 Emotional-Social Behavior

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	24.59	12.30	2	6.31	***
Within	35.09	1.95	18		
Total	59.68		20		

TABLE 115

Category 18 Suppression of Sex

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	5.07	2.54	2	6.67	***
Within	6.81	.38	18		
Total	11.88		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 116

Category 24 Comradeship and Sharing

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.99	1.00	2	3.02	*
Within	5.87	.33	18		
Total	7.86		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

There is a definite similarity between the total Minnowbrook group and the male sub-group in areas directly related to the retardate's adjustment. Again, none of these significant categories show unusual variability in Question 3, indicating the reliability of the observed change.

The female sub-population of the Minnowbrook group showed no statistically significant change at the .01 or .05 levels over the three test administrations on the AMR items. However, trends at the .10 level were noted in three categories: 14 - Educational Implications and Treatment, 18 - Suppression of Sexuality, and 24 - Comradeship and Sharing (Tables 117, 118, 119).

TABLE 117

Category 14 Educational Implications and Treatment

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	4.10	2.05	2	2.81	*
Within	28.49	.73	39		
Total	32.59		41		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 118

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE MINNOWBROOK GROUP ON THE AMR (MOTHERS N=14)

Category 18 Suppression of Sex

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	2.60	1.30	2	2.65	*
Within	18.96	.49	39		
Total	21.56		41		

TABLE 119

Category 24 Comradeship and Sharing

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.02	.51	2	3.00	*
Within	6.72	.17	39		
Total	7.74		41		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

This represents a shift from the trend noted for the preceding Cazenovia group where the female sub-group showed more significant change than the males. In this instance the reverse seems to be the case and it is assumed that counseling and the post-counseling period did not bring about any significant sustained change in attitudes toward retardation.

The Minnowbrook group shows greatest change due to counseling on specific attitudes relevant to retardation in areas primarily concerned with the recognition of the retardate as an individual and subsequent planning and practices which determine selective placement. Greater shifts in specific attitudes are observed when compared to general attitudes.

(3) Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC)

(a) Category Variable Score

Significance on the 35 category variables of the GSC for the Minnowbrook group was reached in three instances: 3 - Acquiescence (.05), 4 - Acquisition (.01), 21 - optimism (.01) (Tables 120, 121, 122). No differences at the .10 level were obtained.

TABLE 120

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE MINNOWBROOK GROUP ON THE GSC . VARIABLES (TOTAL N=21)

Category 3 Acquiescence

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	5.11	2.56	2	3.41	**
Within	45.22	.75	60		
Total	50.33		62		

TABLE 121

Category 4 Acquisition

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.90	.95	2	7.31	***
Within	8.07	.13	60		
Total	9.97		62		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 122

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE MINNOWBROOK GROUP ON THE GSC VARIABLES (TOTAL N=21)

Category 21 Optimism

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	.64	.32	2	8.00	***
Within	2.27	.04	60		
Total	2.91		62		

The Minnowbrook group reveals a concern for personal adjustment to life situations with a yielding but hopeful reflection on their problems. They also seem to be interested in the material achievement goals of themselves or their offspring.

The male sub-group of the Minnowbrook population showed statistical significance at the .01 level in one category, 4 - Acquisition (Table 123). Category 21 - Optimism reached significance at the .10 level (Table 124). No differences appeared at the .05 level.

TABLE 123

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE MINNOWBROOK GROUP ON THE GSC VARIABLES (FATHERS N=7)

Category 4 Acquisition

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	7.85	3.93	2	8.01	***
Within	8.85	.49	18		
Total	16.70		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 124

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE MINNOWBROOK GROUP ON THE GSC. VARIABLES (FATHERS N=7)

Category 21 Optimism

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	.41	.21	2	3.42	*
Within	1.14	.06	18		
Total	1.55		20		

In contrasting these findings with other areas and the areas of major initial variation for the full study population, counseling tends to make the fathers less introspective and preoccupied with personal concerns and thus more free to deal with areas of less close personal involvement. Most strikingly, they appear to be highly optimistic in their drive for material achievement.

The female sub-population of the Minnowbrook group displayed significance at the .01 level in one instance also, category 21 - Optimism (Table 127). Trends at the .10 level were noted in three areas, 4 - Acquisition, 11 - Deference, and 32 - Succorance (Tables 125 126, 128). No differences were obtained at the .05 level.

TABLE 125

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE MINNOWBROOK GROUP ON THE GSC VARIABLES (MOTHERS N=14)

Category 4 Acquisition

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	.59	.30	2	2.46	*
Within	4.76	.12	39		
Total	5.35		41		

TABLE 126

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE MINNOWBROOK GROUP ON THE GSC VARIABLES (MOTHERS N=14)

Category 11 Deference

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.52	.76	2	2.45	*
Within	11.93	.31	39		
Total	13.45		41		

TABLE 127

Category 21 Optimism

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	.76	.38	2	5.43	***
Within	2.68	.07	39		
Total	3.44		41		

TABLE 128

Category 32 Succorance

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	2.45	1.23	2	2.99	
Within	15.92	.41	39		
Total	18.37		41		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

A possible maternal trend toward seeing possibilities for their own and their retarded child's adjustment might be indicated here as the result of both information and support afforded by the counseling situation. The additional areas where trends were found help to bear this assumption out.

(b) Gradient Sentence Completion Direction Score

No significant differences on direction scores for the Gradient Sentence Completion Test were found through the analysis of variance treatment of the data from the three test administrations of the Minnowbrook clinic group.

(4) Stern Activities Index (SAI)

No significant differences on the analysis of variance of the SAI data from the three test administrations were found for the total Minnowbrook group or for either of its sex sub-group components. It is assumed that on the basis of this comparison no significant change was brought about by counseling treatment and the post-counseling in the Minnowbrook group on the need personality variables measured by the SAI.

Counseling treatment in the Minnowbrook group tends to have the overall effect of promoting involvement and a climate of acceptance for certain situations. This is predominantly manifest in the areas more closely concerned with specific attitudes and individual reaction patterns toward retardation as determined by the AMR and GSC. There is an interesting shift in the expression of need personality on the GSC toward a greater tendency to extend oneself and interact with others.

C. Twice a Month Clinic Group:

(1) Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI)

No significant differences at either the .01 or the .05 level for the total group or the male or female sub-groups were found by analysis of variance of the data for the three test administrations of the PARI with the clinic group comprised of individuals attending counseling twice a month over a three month period. One trend at the .10 level appeared for the father sub-group on category 22 - Non-Punishment (Table 129).

TABLE 129

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST
ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE TWICE A MONTH GROUP
ON THE PARI (FATHERS N=4)

Category 22 Non-Punishment

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.29	.65	2	3.07	*
Within	1.88	.21	9		
Total	3.17		11		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

This tendency for minimal change with counseling and the post-counseling period on the PARI items relating to children, child-rearing, and parental adjustment is also seen in the results of the Casenovia group where no differences are found at any level, and in the Minnowbrook group where differences are minimal. Counseling of an extensive nature does not seem to effect an appreciable shift in these general patterns of child-rearing practices.

(2) Attitude Scale Toward Mental Retardation (AMR)

No significant differences at either the .01 or the .05 level for the total group or either sub-group were found on analysis of variance of the data from the three test administrations on AMR items for the clinic group which met for counseling sessions twice a month over a three month period. Trends at the .10 level were noted in only two instances: category 17 - Expression of Affection for the total sample (Table 130) and category 17 - Expression of Affection for the male sub-group (Table 131).

TABLE 130

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST
ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE TWICE A MONTH GROUP
ON THE AMR (TOTAL N=11)

Category 17 Expression of Affection

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.53	.77	2	3.19	*
Within	7.21	.24	30		
Total	8.74		32		

TABLE 131

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST
ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE TWICE A MONTH GROUP
ON THE AMR (FATHERS N=4)

Category 17 Expression of Affection

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	6.50	3.25	2	3.65	*
Within	8.00	.89	9		
Total	14.50		11		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

The Twice a Month population does not seem to have appreciably altered their expressed attitude patterns with specific reference to retardation as they are measured by the AMR.

(3) Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC)

(a) Category Variable Scores

Significance on GSC category variables was found in the Twice a Month group at the .05 level in two categories: 2 - Achievement, and

25 - Play (Tables 132 and 135). Trends at the .10 level were found in three cases: 7 - Autonomy, 14 - Identification, and 31 - Submissiveness (Tables 133, 135, 136). No differences occurred at the .01 level.

TABLE 132

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE TWICE A MONTH GROUP ON THE GSC VARIABLES (TOTAL N=11)

Category 2 Achievement

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	14.93	7.47	2	4.12	**
Within	54.36	1.81	30		
Total	69.29		32		

TABLE 133

Category 7 Autonomy

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	.86	.43	2	2.53	
Within	4.97	.17	30		
Total	5.83		32		

TABLE 134

Category 14 Identification

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.56	.78	2	2.79	*
Within	8.35	.28	30		
Total	9.91		32		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 135

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE TWICE-A-MONTH GROUP ON THE GSC VARIABLES (TOTAL N=11) (CONT)

Category 25 Play

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	3.98	1.99	2	4.85	**
Within	12.40	.41	30		
Total	16.38		32		

TABLE 136

Category 31 Submissiveness

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	.50	.25	2	2.78	*
Within	2.61	.09	30		
Total	3.11		32		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

Both the significant categories are related to activity and expressive behaviors in contrast to the more withdrawn and non-interactive reaction patterns. The importance of striving for a goal, as well as leisure is stressed by the total group.

The Twice a Month male sub-group did not reach significance at the .01 or .05 levels in terms of change due to counseling treatment on any of the 35 category need variables. However, trends at the .10 level were indicated in categories 2 - Achievement and 14 - Identification (Tables 137, 138). Counseling does not seem to have effected as predominant a shift in the expression of personality need variables in the fathers as it did for the total group.

TABLE 137

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE TWICE-A MONTH GROUP ON THE GSC VARIABLES (FATHERS N=4)

Category 2 Achievement

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	52.79	26.40	2	4.20	*
Within	56.63	6.29	9		
Total	109.42		11		

TABLE 138

Category 14 Identification

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	4.87	2.44	2	3.29	*
Within	6.63	.74	9		
Total	11.50		11		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

The mother sub-group of the Twice a Month clinic sample showed the most change on the GSC variable scores. Significance at the .05 level was reached in three categories: 12 - Description, 31 - Submissiveness, and 33 - Supernaturalism (Tables 139, 142, 143). Two categories exhibited tendencies at the .10 level: 18 - Narcissism and 25 - Play (Tables 140 and 141). Significance at the .01 level was not reached for any category.

TABLE 139

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE TWICE-A-MONTH GROUP ON THE GSC VARIABLES (MOTHERS N=7)

Category 12 Description

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	3.35	1.68	2	4.79	**
Within	6.32	.35	18		
Total	9.67		20		

TABLE 140

Category 18 Narcissism

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.01	.51	2	2.97	*
Within	3.10	.17	18		
Total	4.11		20		

TABLE 141

Category 25 Play

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	3.52	1.76	2	2.89	*
Within	10.89	.61	18		
Total	14.41		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 142

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE TWICE A MONTH GROUP ON THE GSC VARIABLES (MOTHERS N=7)
(CONT)

Category 31 Submissiveness

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.23	.62	2	3.62	**
Within	3.02	.17	18		
Total	4.25		20		

TABLE 143

Category 33 Supernaturalism

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	2.65	1.33	2	5.30	**
Within	4.45	.25	18		
Total	7.10		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

The three categories displaying significant change are of a widely divergent nature and for the most part are dissimilar from those significant in either the total group or the male sub-group as well as the other three clinic treatment groups. There is a tendency for greater shift to occur on the part of the mothers on topics related to both the expressive and non-expressive aspects of behavior. A greater concern with one's own thoughts and behavior seems to be present.

(b) Category Direction Scores

No significant difference on GSC Direction scores were found through the analysis of variance treatment for the three sets of data on the Twice a Month Clinic group. This stability of the direction scores assigned the variables suggests the major shift occurs in the variable content rather than direction orientation.

(4) Stern Activities Index (SAI)

None of the 40 SAI category variables reached statistical significance on analysis of variance over the three test administrations for the total Twice a Month clinic group.

For the male sub-group, one category, 4 - Play, reached significance at the .05 level (Table 144). No further differences at the .01 or .10 levels were obtained. Rather significantly, the importance of leisure is considered essential by the fathers.

TABLE 144

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST
ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE TWICE A MONTH GROUP
ON THE SAI (FATHERS N=4)

Category 4 Play

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	2.54	1.27	2	6.68	**
Within	1.69	.19	9		
Total	4.23		11		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

For the female sub-group, a different variable, 7 - Adaptiveness, showed significance at the .05 level also (Table 145). No further differences were obtained at the .01 or .10 levels. The mothers, in this group, are more concerned with criticism and the possibility of humiliation which is not reflected by any other group.

TABLE 145

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE TWICE A MONTH GROUP ON THE SAI (MOTHERS N=7)

Category 7 Adaptiveness

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.23	.62	2	4.73	**
Within	2.32	.13	18		
Total	3.55		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

Counseling of a more extensive nature seems to have negligible effect on the alteration of need personality variables measured by the SAI in the Twice a Month Group. The Twice a Month clinic group, for the most part, shows considerably less change over the three test administrations than either of the more Concentrated groups (Cazenovia and Minnowbrook) in terms of the time length of the counseling period.

The most noticeable diminution of change in the Twice a Month group seems to exist on the specific items relating to retardation as measured by the AMR. The categories showing significance on the GSC variable scores are also quite different from those of the two preceding groups in the need personality structure. A tendency for change to appear on more non-emotional or objectively oriented items seems to exist. The GSC exhibits the greatest amount of change for this group.

In terms of the frequency of significance for the two sex subgroup breakdowns, there seems to be roughly equal distribution. However, a greater preponderance of difference on the GSC variables seems to exist for the females. They show greater shift on areas concerned with individual beliefs and self-understanding in contrast to more activity orientation on the part of the fathers.

In contrast to the two more concentrated groups, the Twice a Month group generally shows less alteration of expressed attitudes as well as somewhat different patterns. Since initial homogeneity of the groups on these measures was ascertained in a previous question, these differences seem pertinent to the effect of counseling. Counseling seems only to have a minor effect on the structure of need personality variables.

D. Once a Month Clinic Group:

(1) Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI)

Two of the 19 categories of the PARI contrasted for the total group showed significant differences over the three test administrations at the .05 level: 17 - Expression of Affection and 18 - Autonomy of the Child (Tables 151 and 152). Six additional categories indicated trends at the .10 level of statistical significance: 1 - Encouraging Verbalization, 5 - Marital Conflict, 6 - Strictness, 11 - Equalitarianism, 16 - Comradeship and Sharing, and 19 - Achievement (Tables 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 153). No significant differences at the .01 level were detected.

TABLE 146

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST
ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE ONCE A MONTH GROUP
ON THE PARI (TOTAL GROUP N=8)

Category 1 Encouraging Verbalization

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	15.27	7.64	2	3.32	*
Within	48.22	2.30	21		
Total	63.49		23		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 147

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE ONCE A MONTH GROUP ON THE PARI (TOTAL GROUP N=8) (CONT)

Category 5 Marital Conflict

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	5.34	2.67	2	2.78	*
Within	20.16	.96	21		
Total	25.50		23		

TABLE 148

Category 6 Strictness

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	4.87	2.44	2	3.16	*
Within	16.13	.77	21		
Total	21.00		23		

TABLE 149

Category 11 Equalitarianism

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	8.27	4.14	2	2.74	*
Within	31.61	1.51	21		
Total	39.88		23		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 150

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE ONCE A MONTH GROUP ON THE PARI (TOTAL GROUP N=8) (CONT)

Category 16 Comradeship and Sharing

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	13.04	6.52	2	2.65	*
Within	51.70	2.46	21		
Total	64.74		23		

TABLE 151

Category 17 Expression of Affection

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	18.37	9.19	2	4.48	**
Within	43.13	2.05	21		
Total	61.50		23		

TABLE 152

Category 18 Autonomy of Child

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	11.65	5.83	2	4.16	**
Within	29.41	1.40	21		
Total	41.06		23		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 153

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE ONCE A MONTH GROUP ON THE PARI (TOTAL GROUP N=8)

(CONT)

Category 19 Achievement

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	17.48	8.74	2	3.16	*
Within	58.23	2.77	21		
Total	75.71		23		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

The once a Month group is interested in the patterns of parental behavior which are related to the handling of children. They want to provide affection, security, and a degree of independence.

No significant differences nor trends are found for the father subgroup of the once a Month clinic group on the PARI sub-scale scores indicating no major changes due to counseling.

For the mother sub-group, no significant differences at the .01 or .05 level were found on the overall PARI scores. However, trends at the .10 level were noted in two categories: 1 - Encouraging Verbalization and 19 - Achievement (Tables 154, 155). Both these categories also were indicative of trends for the total once a Month population.

Counseling of an extensive nature seems to have a negligible effect on both the males and females but produces a significant shift in attitudes concerned with child-rearing practices relevant to parental control of the activities of the child.

Of the four clinic groups, the once a Month group, having the least concentrated time period of counseling, shows the greatest tendency for change over the three test administrations on the variables measured by the PARI.

TABLE 154

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE ONCE A MONTH GROUP ON THE PARI (MOTHERS N=4)

Category 1 Encouraging Verbalization

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	35.37	17.69	2	3.90	*
Within	40.88	4.54	9		
Total	76.25		11		

TABLE 155

Category 19 Achievement

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	22.54	11.27	2	3.20	*
Within	31.69	3.52	9		
Total	54.23		11		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

(2) Attitude Scale Toward Mental Retardation (AMR)

On the analysis of variance of the AMR data for the three test administrations no significant differences nor trends were obtained suggesting no major change in these items specifically referent to retardation over the counseling and post-counseling period.

Differences were noted in category 12 - Comprehension of Self and others for the male sub-group of the once a Month population at the .05 level (Table 156). No further differences at the .01 or .10 levels were obtained. The fathers seem peculiarly alert to the limitations of their retarded children. They want to establish some basis for making comparisons and establishing suitable standards for the child.

TABLE 156

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST
ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE ONCE A MONTH GROUP
ON THE AMR (FATHERS N=4)

Category 12 Comprehension of Self/and others

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	15.87	7.94	2	4.87	**
Within	14.69	1.63	9		
Total	30.56		11		

Similarly significant differences for the female sub-group were also found in only one area: Category 19 - Encouraging Verbalization, at the .01 level (Table 157).

TABLE 157

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST
ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE ONCE A MONTH GROUP
ON THE AMR (MOTHERS N=4)

Category 19 Encouraging Verbalization

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	6.29	3.15	2	14.30	***
Within	1.94	.22	9		
Total	8.23		11		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

Mothers appear to be interested in getting the retardate to verbalize as a means of self-expression.

Both fathers and mothers are imbued with the need to encourage the individual growth of the retarded child either through verbalization of ideas or an understanding of limitations.

Little change through counseling is observed in specific attitude patterns in the once a Month group. The protracted counseling periods did not allow for shifts to occur.

(3) Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC)

(a) Category Variable Scores

Significance at the .05 level was found in two of the 35 GSC category variables over the counseling and post-counseling interim period in the once a Month clinic group: category variable 8 - Avoidance and 31 - Submissiveness (Tables 158, 159). No additional differences or trends were derived at the .01 or .10 levels.

TABLE 158

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST
ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE ONCE A MONTH GROUP
ON THE GSC VARIABLES (TOTAL N=8)

Category 8 Avoidance

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.40	.70	2	3.50	**
Within	4.23	.20	21		
Total	5.63		23		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 159

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE ONCE A MONTH GROUP ON THE GSC VARIABLES (TOTAL N=8) (CONT)

Category 31 Submissiveness

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	.17	.09	2	4.25	**
Within	.50	.02	21		
Total	.67		23		

Both these variables are related to concepts of yielding to or avoidance of experiences on the part of the parents. The avoidance is stimulated through fear of censure or a passive reaction to people.

While no significant differences at the .01 or .05 levels were obtained for the male once a Month sub-group on GSC variable scores, trends at the .10 level were found in two categories: 6 - Aggression and 8 - Avoidance (Tables 160, 161).

TABLE 160

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE ONCE A MONTH GROUP ON THE GSC VARIABLES (FATHERS N=4)

Category 6 Aggression

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	4.29	2.15	2	3.25	*
Within	5.94	.66	9		
Total	10.23		11		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 161

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE ONCE A MONTH GROUP ON THE GSC VARIABLES (FATHERS N=4) (CONT)

Category 8 Avoidance

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	2.79	1.40	2	4.23	*
Within	2.94	.33	9		
Total	5.73		11		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

No significant differences at any level were obtained on the analysis of variance treatment of the data from the three test administrations for the mother segment of the once a Month group.

Thus, there seems to have been a minimal change as a result of counseling treatment and the post-test period with this group which met once a month over a six months period on the need personality variables measured by the GSC. A major shift occurs in the total group comparison on aspects related to the involvement and nature of the behavior of the parent in interactive situations.

(b) Category Direction Scores

No significant differences on direction scores for the GSC were found through the analysis of variance treatment of the data from the three test administrations of the once a Month clinic group.

(4) Stern Activities Index (SAI)

No significant differences at any of the three levels were found on the analysis of variance treatment of the SAI scores over the three test administrations for either the total once a Month group or the male sub-population. Trends at the .10 level were noted for the female sub-group in two categories; 3 - Change and 32 - Sameness (Tables 162, 163). These two variables are analagous to one another in terms of the dynamics involved. The contrast is between repetitive behavior or unroutinized behavior.

TABLE 162

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE THREE TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE ONCE A MONTH GROUP ON THE SAI (MOTHERS N=4)

Category 3 Change

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.54	.77	2	3.21	*
Within	2.19	.24	9		
Total	3.73		11		

TABLE 163

Category 32 Sameness

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.54	.77	2	3.21	*
Within	22.19	.24	9		
Total	3.73		11		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

Thus, no appreciable change on the personality variables measured by the SAI seems evident from the analysis of variance of the data on the once a Month group over the three test administrations. Here again, this counseling did not influence shifts in these need personality variables at any greater frequency than the more intensive schema.

The overall picture supplied by the separate analysis of the data over the three test administrations for the Once a Month group generally lends support to the patterns already noted. Major change for this group is found on the PARI scores related to parental patterns of control of the expressive behavior of the child. Notable alteration due to counseling also appears on the GSC in relation to the involvement of the parent in expressive modes of behavior. Counseling seems to effect a change in the degree of acceptance and involvement in relation to both the parent himself and his attitudes toward child-rearing. As the time span of counseling increases from the two more concentrated treatment groups (Cazenovia and Minnowbrook) to the more distributed counseling session treatments (Twice a Month and Once a Month), the proportion of change on the individual variables of the four measures generally decreases.

E. Control Group

The results of the data on the four instruments over the two test periods administered the test Control population is presented here for comparison purposes. The findings cannot be considered the same in terms of statistical treatment since data from the four experimental groups were over three test administrations whereas the Control includes only two sets.

(1) Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI)

No statistical significance on PARI scores was reached for the total Control group or the male sub-group at any of the three levels. Trends at the .10 level were noted in two instances for the female sub-group: 7 - Irritability and 18 - Autonomy of Child (Tables 164 and 165). Thus no major change over the two periods is assumed.

TABLE 164

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE TWO TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE CONTROL GROUP ON THE PARI (MOTHERS N=8)

Category 7 Irritability

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	3.78	3.78	1	4.11	*
Within	12.94	.92	14		
Total	16.72		15		

TABLE 165

Category 18 Autonomy of Child

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	3.78	3.78	1	3.47	*
Within	15.19	1.09	14		
Total	18.97		15		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

(2) Attitude Scale Toward Mental Retardation (AMR)

No AMR variables were significant at the .01 or .05 levels for the Control group. Two trends at the .10 level were found: 2 - Genetic Responsibility for the total group (Table 166 and category 21 - Avoidance of Communication for the male sub-group (Table 167). Here again, the paucity of statistical significance supports the assumption of no change without counseling treatment of any kind.

TABLE 166

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES OVER THE TWO TEST ADMINISTRATIONS FOR THE CONTROL GROUP ON THE AMR (TOTAL N=15)

Category 2 Genetic Responsibility

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	.28	.28	1	3.11	*
Within	2.49	.09	28		
Total	2.77		29		

TABLE 167

Category 21 Avoidance of Communication

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	4.93	4.93	1	4.36	*
Within	13.55	1.13	12		
Total	18.48		13		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

(3) Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC)

No significant differences were noted on the analysis of variance of the GSC data for either Variable or Direction Scores for the total Control group or either of its sex sub-groups. Here again, the lack of a counseling experience is assumed to be the variable influencing this stability.

(4) Stern Activities Index (SAI)

No statistically significant differences were obtained on the analysis of variance of SAI scores for the Control group or its component sub-groups. The group maintains a stability of pattern in the absence of an intermediary counseling treatment.

No significant differences at the crucial .01 or .05 levels are obtained for the Control group for any of the categories of the four instruments. No significant change on any of the variables occurs when no counseling is provided. These negative findings are in contrast to the differences found in various of the experimental groups. The absence of the counseling variable seems to be the factor influencing the lack of significant change on any of the measures contrasted.

Counseling does seem to have an effect on the attitude and need personality structure of parents of the educable mentally handicapped. Differences beyond chance occur in all but SAI scores for one or more of the treatment groups.

Somewhat different patterns are noted for the various instruments depending upon the nature of the variables. On the PARI, which is concerned with aspects relating to child-rearing and marital adjustment, change is negligible in all but the Once a Month group. It is interesting to note that this occurrence in the most distributed counseling group is a deviation from the pattern shown by the other three groups, It may be indicative of a relationship between the time variable and these general patterns. It is possible that the dynamics inherent in effecting change on these more generalized patterns require a more extensive period as was provided in the Once a Month group for the acceptance and consolidation of concepts.

In the consideration of the items with specific reference to retardation (AMR), the group having the second most concentrated treatment (Minnowbrook) shows greater change for the overall period, followed by the most concentrated (Cazenovia) group and then the two distributed groups.

Perhaps the more complete immersion in the problem of retardation and adjustment to it which was more possible in the nature of both the concentrated timing and handling (away from home for the full period) is responsible for the greater observed change in the Minnowbrook and Cazenovia groups on the specific attitude patterns toward retardation. Somewhat different patterns in terms of areas of change on the specific items relating to retardation seem to exist in that the Cazenovia and Minnowbrook groups show change in reference to both the personal and familial adjustment of the child as well as social and long-range goals, whereas the Twice a Month and once a Month groups seem to more singularly show change in only personal adjustment and child-rearing areas. So little change is shown in these two latter groups that these observations must be considered with caution.

Less variation in terms of the factor of time span of counseling seems evident in the frequency of significant change noted in the GSC variable scores. Here, patterns similar to those noted on the AMR are again obvious: (1) a slightly greater frequency of change in the Minnowbrook than the Cazenovia group and a tendency downward to the other two less concentrated groups with less shift in the once a Month than the Twice a Month group; (2) a tendency for different variables to exhibit change with the greatest demarcation noticeable between the two more concentrated and the two more distributed groups. There is a minimum of overlap of variables showing change among any of the four groups. There seems to be a general tendency for the more concentrated groups to show more change, recognition and immersion within problem areas rather than avoidance or yielding behavior. This is in contrast to the two more distributed groups which show significant alteration in facets more concerned with self-realization and goal oriented topics.

Negligible change noted in all four groups on the SAI would seem to indicate little effect from any of the four counseling treatments on the need personality variables measured by the SAI. The more structured characteristic of this instrument may be a crucial factor in these findings. The facets tapped represent more ingrained personality factors which may be more resistive to change.

A perusal of the results of the sex sub-groups provides no clear picture of sex differences other than those noted in consideration of the individual groups.

A recapitulation of the results for the total groups shows indications of change due to counseling over the entire study period greater than attributable to chance. This observation is reinforced by the negative results consistently observed for the Control group which received no counseling. There are somewhat different patterns for the various treatment groups. Generally, the change occurs on the PARI, AMR, and GSC variables. These instruments are more related to child-rearing practices and retardation than the SAI. It is also interesting to note that the intensity of the counseling seems to have a selected effect on the alteration of attitudes and need personality structure. The intensive counseling (Cazenovia and Minnowbrook) generally produces greater change in specific attitudes (AMR) whereas the more extensive treatment (once a Month and Twice a Month) tends to influence a shift on general attitudes. Little differentiation as to specific treatment is discernible for the GSC need personality variables. Thus, as the time span of counseling increases from the two more concentrated treatment groups to the more distributed counseling treatment, the proportion of change on the individual variables of the four measures generally decreases.

QUESTION 5. WHAT IS THE INFLUENCE OF THE LENGTH OF THE COUNSELING PERIOD UPON THE ATTITUDE AND NEED PERSONALITY STRUCTURE OF PARENTS OF THE EDUCABLE MENTALLY HANDICAPPED AT EACH TESTING PERIOD: (a) IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING TERMINATION OF COUNSELING AND (b) AFTER A 6-9 MONTHS TIME INTERVAL?

In order to better determine whether differences in attitude and need personality structure exist as a result of the varied length of the counseling period, analysis of variance was performed over the four clinic groups on the data from each of the three test periods for all categories of the measures utilized. Significant results are presented and discussed in this section (Tables 168-332). The data from each of the three administrations for each instrument is presented before moving on to the next instrument. Data on the subjects in the four clinic treatment (N=52) groups are included in the comparison. Data of the two sex sub-groups are also presented separately for each administration.

A. Discomfort Relief Quotient (DRQ).

As the scores for the DRQ were obtained from the interview which was administered once, only administration I of this measure can be presented and contrasted.

On the analysis of variance of the five DRQ scores of the experimental group no statistically significant differences were found at the .01 or .05 level. One significant trend at the .10 level was noted in category 3 - Activity-Goals (Table 168).

TABLE 168

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF DRQ SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE FIRST TESTING PERIOD (N=52)

Category 3 Activity-Goals

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	259.98	86.66	3	2.29	*
Within	1814.16	37.80	48		
Total	2074.14		51		

The male subgroup showed significant difference among the four clinic groups on category 2 - Neighborhood at the .05 level (Table 169). No other significant differences were noted at either the .01 or .10 level. No significant differences at any of the three criterion levels were found in the analysis of the female subgroup data.

TABLE 169

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF DRQ SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE FIRST TESTING PERIOD (FATHERS N=21)

Category 2 Neighborhood

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	481.17	160.39	3	3.69	**
Within	738.65	43.45	17		
Total	1219.82		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

These patterns compare quite similarly with the findings reported in Question 3 on the total project population comparison of DRQ scores. A somewhat lesser variation seems to exist in both the entire group and the male subgroup for the experimental population. No significant variation is noted in either case for the female subgroup. Thus minimal variation seems to be present in the experimental population on the DRQ categories as indices of familial adjustment. Those areas which indicate variability tend to be those of a less personalized orientation. Familial adjustment seems relatively consistent throughout the experimental group.

B. Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI)

(1) Administration I

Statistically significant variation at the .01 level was found in five of the 19 PARI categories for the experimental group: 1 - Encouraging Verbalization, 11 - Equalitarianism, 16 - Comradeship and Sharing, 17 - Expression of Affection, and 18 - Autonomy of Child (Tables 170, 171, 172, 173, 174). No additional categories showed significance at either the .05 or .10 level.

TABLE 170

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PARI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE FIRST TESTING PERIOD (N=52)

Category 1 Encouraging Verbalization

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	24.15	8.05	3	10.88	***
Within	35.32	.74	48		
Total	59.47		51		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 171

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PARI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE FIRST TESTING PERIOD (N=52)

(CONT)

Category 11 Equalitarianism

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	15.67	5.22	3	10.04	***
Within	25.08	.52	48		
Total	40.75		51		

TABLE 172

Category 16 Comradeship and Sharing

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	16.08	5.36	3	6.78	***
Within	37.92	.79	48		
Total	54.00		51		

TABLE 173

Category 17 Expression of Affection

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	21.58	7.19	3	7.12	***
Within	48.50	1.01	48		
Total	70.08		51		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 174

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PARI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE FIRST TESTING PERIOD (N=52) (CONT)

Category 18 Autonomy of Child

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	15.23	5.08	3	8.32	***
Within	29.13	.61	48		
Total	44.36		51		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

Each of these five categories which show pre-test variability within the four groups comprising the experimental group is predominantly concerned with parental handling of children. The frequency of variation is slightly less than that found on the similar comparison for the total study population in Question 3.

The male sub-group showed significant variation at the .05 level on three of the 30 categories: 1 - Encouraging Verbalization, 7 - Irritability, and 11 - Equalitarianism (Tables 175, 176, 177). Additional variation at the .10 level was noted in two categories: 15 - Ascendancy, and 18 - Autonomy of Child (Tables 178 and 179). No significant differences were found at the .01 level.

TABLE 175

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PARI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE FIRST TESTING PERIOD (FATHERS N=21)

Category 1 Encouraging Verbalization

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	17.75	5.92	3	3.82	**
Within	26.42	1.55	17		
Total	44.17		20		

TABLE 176

Category 7 Irritability

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	17.38	5.79	3	4.32	**
Within	22.74	1.34	17		
Total	40.12		20		

TABLE 177

Category 11 Equalitarianism

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	11.29	3.76	3	3.39	**
Within	18.81	1.11	17		
Total	30.10		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 178

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PARI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE FIRST TESTING PERIOD (FATHERS N=21) (CONT)

Category 15 Ascendancy

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	14.04	4.68	3	2.87	*
Within	27.73	1.63	17		
Total	41.77		20		

TABLE 179

Category 18 Autonomy of Child

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	12.12	4.04	3	2.62	*
Within	26.11	1.54	17		
Total	38.23		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

The appearance of both categories, 7 - Irritability and 15 - Ascendancy, seems to indicate variation for the father sub-group in areas concerned with parental adjustment as well as child handling aspects. This pattern and frequency is very similar to that found for the entire population of males on initial variability in Question 3.

Significant variation for the female sub-group found at either the .01 or .05 level in six of the 26 categories: 1 - Encouraging Verbalization (.01), 7 - Irritability (.05), 11 - Equqalitarianism (.01), 16 - Comradeship and Sharing (.01), 17 - Expression of Affection (.01), and

18 - Autonomy of the Child (.01) (Tables 180, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186). One additional trend at the .10 level was found in category 5 - Marital Conflict (Table 181).

TABLE 180

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PARI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE FIRST TESTING PERIOD (MOTHERS N=31)

Category 1 Encouraging Verbalization

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	32.93	10.98	3	7.84	***
Within	37.90	1.40	27		
Total	70.83		30		

TABLE 181

Category 5 Marital Conflict

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	12.97	4.32	3	2.42	*
Within	48.36	1.79	27		
Total	61.33		30		

TABLE 182

Category 7 Irritability

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	15.92	5.31	3	3.47	**
Within	41.21	1.53	27		
Total	57.13		30		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 183

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PARI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE FIRST TESTING PERIOD (MOTHERS N=31) (CONT)

Category 11 Equalitarianism

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	21.61	7.20	3	6.73	***
Within	28.92	1.07	27		
Total	50.53		30		

TABLE 184

Category 16 Comradeship and Sharing

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	29.94	9.98	3	6.24	***
Within	43.24	1.60	27		
Total	73.18		30		

TABLE 185

Category 17 Expression of Affection

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	40.45	13.48	3	10.37	***
Within	35.21	1.30	27		
Total	75.66		30		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 186

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PARI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE FIRST TESTING PERIOD (MOTHERS N=31) (CONT)

Category 18 Autonomy of Child

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	19.51	6.50	3	6.70	***
Within	26.29	.97	27		
Total	45.80		30		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

The patterns of variation for this female sub-group on initial PARI scores are similar to those of the male sub-group in that differences are found in both aspects of parental handling and personal adjustment of the child and personal or marital adjustment of the parent.

(2) Administration II

A fewer number of PARI categories reached significance among the four groups at the post-counseling administration than for the pre-counseling battery. In addition, those categories which showed significance did so at less critical levels than in Administration I. No significance at the .01 level was found. Two categories: 1 - Encouraging Verbalization and 11 - Equalitarianism (Tables 187 and 188) were significant at the .05 level. Category 18 - Autonomy of the Child showed significance at the .10 level (Table 189).

TABLE 187

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PARI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE SECOND TESTING PERIOD (N=52)

Category 1 Encouraging Verbalization

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	3.70	1.23	3	3.74	**
Within	15.61	.33	48		
Total	19.31		51		

TABLE 188

Category 11 Equalitarianism

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	3.56	1.19	3	4.09	**
Within	14.08	.29	48		
Total	17.64		51		

TABLE 189

Category 18 Autonomy of Child

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.89	.63	3	2.25	*
Within	13.21	.28	48		
Total	15.10		51		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

All three of the categories reaching significance on Administration II also show intra-group variation on Administration I. It seems that counseling did not alter these patterns sufficiently to effect a major change in the group heterogeneity although in all three cases significance is noted at a less critical level. Counseling seems to have somewhat decreased intra-group variation.

Three categories showed significance at the .05 level for the male sub-population on the analysis of variance of the 30 PARI category scores. These were: 7 - Irritability, 15 - Ascendancy, and 18 - Autonomy of the Child (Tables 191, 192, 193). One category, 5 - Marital Conflict reached significance at the .10 level (Table 190). No significance was shown at the .01 level.

TABLE 190

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF
PARI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP
FOR THE SECOND TESTING PERIOD (FATHERS N=21)

Category 5 Marital Conflict

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	5.59	1.86	3	2.91	*
Within	10.82	.64	17		
Total	16.41		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 191

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PARI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE SECOND TESTING PERIOD (FATHERS N=21)

(CONT)

Category 7 Irritability

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	14.20	4.73	3	4.12	**
Within	19.60	1.15	17		
Total	33.80		20		

TABLE 192

Category 15 Ascendancy

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	16.90	5.63	3	3.50	**
Within	27.38	1.61	17		
Total	44.28		20		

TABLE 193

Category 18 Autonomy of Child

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	5.86	1.95	3	3.37	**
Within	9.88	.58	17		
Total	15.74		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

The male sub-group shows similar trends to those shown in the second administration in that variation is noted in both child-rearing attitudes and aspects of personal and marital adjustment of the parents. There seems to be a greater tendency for a greater emphasis upon the parent's personal and marital concerns at this point than was noted previously (Administration I) or for the total experimental group. Variation is noted in the 5 - Marital Conflict category where it did not appear previously. The general diminution of variation is accounted for by the removal of significance in areas primarily concerned with aspects of child-rearing related to independence and expressiveness. In three instances, categories which show significant variation initially also do so on the post-counseling breakdown: 7 - Irritability, 15 - Ascendancy, and 18 - Autonomy of the Child. This suggests that counseling does not appreciably alter individual patterns in these areas sufficiently to reduce the intra-group heterogeneity, although the topic foci shifts to a more parent-oriented content.

Only one category, 11 - Equalitarianism (Table 194) showed statistically significant variation (.05) between the female populations of the four experimental groups on the 26 PARI variables. No differences were found at either the .01 or .10 levels.

TABLE 194

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PARI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE SECOND TESTING PERIOD (MOTHERS N=31)

Category 11 Equalitarianism

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	4.30	1.43	3	3.05	**
Within	12.61	.47	27		
Total	16.91		30		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

This represents a substantial reduction in significant variation for the female sub-group from Administration I. The category displaying significance, 11 - Equalitarianism also appeared, but at the more significant .01 level, in Administration I. Counseling seems to have created a shift toward group homogeneity on topics primarily concerned with expressive and interactive behavior of the child.

(3) Administration III

A further decrease in frequency and degree of intra-experimental group variation is noted in the examination of the results of the analysis of variance treatment of the third administration of the PARI 6-9 months after the termination of counseling.

No statistical significance was obtained at either the .01 or the .05 levels. In only one instance, category 6 - Strictness, was a significant trend noted at the .10 level (Table 195). This third set of data continues the pattern of decrease in variation shown between Administration I and II for the experimental group.

TABLE 195

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF
PARI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP
FOR THE THIRD TESTING PERIOD (N=52)

Category 6 Strictness

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	4.76	1.59	3	2.74	*
Within	27.99	.58	48		
Total	32.75		51		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

For the father sub-group, significance was noted at the .05 level in two categories: 20 - Harsh Punishment, and 24 - Irresponsibility of the Father (Tables 198 and 199); and at the .10 level in two instances: category 5 - Marital Conflict and 13 - Inconsiderateness (Tables 196 and 197). No differences occurred at the .01 levels.

TABLE 196

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PARI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE THIRD TESTING PERIOD (FATHERS N=21)

Category 5 Marital Conflict

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	6.92	2.31	3	2.56	*
Within	15.23	.90	17		
Total	22.15		20		

TABLE 197

Category 13 Inconsiderateness

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	9.61	3.20	3	2.52	*
Within	21.51	1.27	17		
Total	31.12	4.47	20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 198

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF PARI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE THIRD TESTING PERIOD (FATHERS N=21) (CONT)

Category 20 Harsh Punishment

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	20.74	6.91	3	4.40	**
Within	26.71	1.57	17		
Total	47.45		20		

TABLE 199

Category 24 Irresponsibility of Father

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	6.91	2.30	3	3.72	**
Within	10.53	.62	17		
Total	17.44		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

This frequency seems to indicate a decrease in intra-group variability from the findings for the male sub-group on Administration I and II. However, differences in the areas of variation are apparent. Only one of the categories, 5 - Marital Conflict, also reaches significance at Administration II. None of the same categories showing significance on the first administration reoccur at this final stage. Variation initially appearing at Test I and/or II has been diminished and variation has been created in other content or press areas. The pattern of the significance at this last testing period is similar to the trend already noted for the male group. Predominant variation seems to exist in personal and marital adjustment areas in contrast to these more directly relevant to patterns of child-rearing. Counseling seems to influence a trend toward homogeneity of child-rearing patterns but allows for the expression of more divergent parental patterns of personal and marital adjustment.

No significant differences were noted in the female sub-group analysis of variance treatment of the Administration III PARI scores. This lack of significance represents a decrease of variation within the female sub-group, a trend similar to that noted for the complete experimental group population. Counseling influences a resolution of inter-group differences on these patterns of child-rearing attitudes.

For the most part the overall picture seen over the pre-counseling, counseling, and post-counseling period indicates a trend for the counseling and post-counseling period to effect more homogeneity within the experimental population on the variables measured by the PARI. Similar trends are suggested in the individual consideration of the various counseling treatment groups in Question 4 and in relationship to the findings on initial variability (Question 3). The male sub-group does not conform to this pattern as consistently as the female sub-group or the entire group. They show initial variation in somewhat more self-oriented areas. They then tend to decrease in variation, due to the counseling treatments, on child-rearing topics but exhibit as essentially new and increased divergence on personal and marital adjustment topics.

C. Attitude Scale Toward Mental Retardation (AMR)

(1) Administration I

On the analysis of variance of the subjects comprising the four experimental groups for Administration I, significant differences at the

.05 level were detected in three instances: categories 9 - Peer Interaction, 12 - Comprehension of Self and others, and 16 - Emotional - Social Behavior (Tables 201, 202 and 204); and at the .10 level in categories 1 - Sexuality and 14 - Educational Implications and Treatment (Tables 200 and 203). No differences at the .01 level were obtained.

TABLE 200

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF AMR SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE FIRST TESTING PERIOD (N=52)

Category 1 Sexuality

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	5.82	1.94	3	2.52	*
Within	37.08	.77	48		
Total	42.90		51		

TABLE 201

Category 9 Peer Interaction

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	12.21	4.07	3	3.60	**
Within	54.19	1.13	48		
Total	66.40		51		

TABLE 202

Category 12 Comprehension of Self and others

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	12.60	4.20	3	2.80	**
Within	71.99	1.50	48		
Total	84.59		51		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 203

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF AMR SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE FIRST TESTING PERIOD (N=52)

(CONT)

Category 14 Educational Implications and Training

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	6.38	2.13	3	2.69	*
Within	38.15	.79	48		
Total	44.53		51		

TABLE 204

Category 16 Emotional-Social Behavior

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	32.42	10.81	3	3.77	**
Within	137.97	2.87	48		
Total	170.39		51		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

Initial variation among the four clinic groups on the AMR seems to focus primarily upon behavior and goals for the retardate and minimally upon the more emotionally laden category areas concerned with reaction patterns toward and the concepts of retardation. There is a slightly greater amount of initial variation on AMR scores in this more composite group than for the full project population described in Question 3. The areas of variation, however, seem to be essentially similar.

The analysis of the male sub-group provided no siginficant differences at the .01 level. Significance at the .05 level was achieved in one instance, category 9 - Peer Interaction (Table 206). Significant trends were found at the .10 level in categories 1 - Sexuality, and 19 - Encouraging Verbalization (Tables 205 and 207).

TABLE 205

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF AMR SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE FIRST TESTING PERIOD (FATHERS N=21)

Category 1 Sexuality

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	9.58	3.19	3	2.58	*
Within	21.10	1.24	17		
Total	30.68		20		

TABLE 206

Category 9 Peer Interaction

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	14.44	4.81	3	4.46	**
Within	18.34	1.08	17		
Total	22.78		20		

TABLE 207

Category 19 Encouraging Verbalization

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	7.06	2.35	3	2.87	*
Within	13.93	.82	17		
Total	20.99		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

The trends indicated here are very similar to those of the full experimental group although a somewhat lesser frequency and distribution of significance is noted. There are also fewer areas of significance shown here than for the male sub-group of the entire study population presented in Question 3. This is the opposite of the pattern just noted for the full experimental group as contrasted to the full study population. In both comparisons, similar patterns appear to emerge.

The female sub-group showed significant differences at the .05 level for two categories: 16 - Emotional-Social Behavior and 28 - Autonomy of the Child (Tables 210 and 211). Significance at the .10 level was also found in three instances: categories 5 - Dependency, 7 - Aggression, and 33 - Achievement (Tables 208, 209, and 212). No significant variation appeared at the .01 level.

TABLE 208

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF
AMR SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP
FOR THE FIRST TESTING PERIOD (MOTHERS N=31)

Category 5 Dependency

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	23.89	7.96	3	2.80	*
Within	76.59	2.84	27		
Total	100.48		30		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 209

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF AMR SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE FIRST TESTING PERIOD (MOTHERS N=31) (CONT)

Category 7 Aggression

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	16.27	5.42	3	2.50	*
Within	58.52	2.17	27		
Total	74.79		30		

TABLE 210

Category 16 Emotional-Social Behavior

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	56.54	18.85	3	3.25	**
Within	156.48	5.80	27		
Total	213.02		30		

TABLE 211

Category 28 Autonomy of Child

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	4.45	1.48	3	3.09	**
Within	13.04	.48	27		
Total	17.49		30		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 212

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF AMR SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE FIRST TESTING PERIOD (MOTHERS N=31) (CONT)

Category 33 Achievement

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	18.84	6.28	3	2.54	*
Within	66.57	2.47	27		
Total	85.41		30		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

The category areas which show variation among the mother population present a somewhat different pattern than that for the total experimental group or the father population. A greater preponderance of variability on more personalized reactions of self-understanding and expression is evident as well as the 33 - Achievement area. There appears to be variation in the areas concerning the behavior and handling of the retardate as was noted for the other two groups. As with the total experimental group, there is a greater frequency of significant variation in this female sub-group than that found for the entire project population or its component sub-groups in Question 3. From a perusal of the significant categories, essentially similar dynamic patterns are noted despite the fact that in only one instance, 33 - Achievement, does the same category appear significant in both comparisons.

(2) Administration II

A greater number of categories exhibited significant variation on the analysis of variance of AMR scores obtained immediately after counseling than for the pre-counseling administration for the experimental group. Significant differences at the .01 level were obtained on category 1 - Sexuality (Table 213), and at the .05 level in categories 3 - Appearance 4 - Normalcy of Development, 5 - Dependency, 6 - Independency, and 29 - Equalitarianism (Tables 214, 215, 216, 217, and 219). A significant trend at the .10 level was also observed in category 9 - Peer Interaction (Table 218).

TABLE 213

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF AMR SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE SECOND TESTING PERIOD (N=52)

Category 1 Sexuality

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	5.22	1.74	3	4.24	***
Within	19.50	.41	48		
Total	24.72		51		

TABLE 214

Category 3 Appearance

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	.91	.30	3	3.37	**
Within	4.22	.09	48		
Total	5.13		51		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 215

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF AMR SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE SECOND TESTING PERIOD (N=52)

(CONT)

Category 4 Normalcy of Development

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	27.82	9.27	3	2.84	**
Within	156.46	3.26	48		
Total	184.28		51		

TABLE 216

Category 5 Dependency

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	18.68	6.23	3	3.56	**
Within	83.97	1.75	48		
Total	102.65		51		

TABLE 217

Category 6 Independency

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	5.62	1.87	3	3.02	**
Within	29.87	.62	48		
Total	35.49		51		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 218

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF AMR SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE SECOND TESTING PERIOD (N=52) (CONT)

Category 9 Peer Interaction

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	6.49	2.16	3	2.30	*
Within	44.93	.94	48		
Total	51.42		51		

TABLE 219

Category 29 Equalitarianism

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	3.01	1.00	3	3.86	**
Within	12.46	.26	48		
Total	15.47		51		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

This pattern is very similar to that already noted for Administration I. Counseling does not seem to have changed the nature of the variation but increases it in a number of related categories. Primary emphasis is on areas relevant to the social acceptability and adjustment of the retardate and appropriate practices concerned with his handling.

No significant differences were obtained for Administration II of the AMR scores of the male segment of the four clinic groups. This seems to be a continuation of the trend noted on the first administration when only one area was significant at the .05 level. Evidentally counseling tends to diminish variability related to retardation in this group at this time.

An analysis of the mother AMR scores immediately following counseling produced significant intra-group variability at the .01 level in category 5 - Dependency (Table 221), and at the .05 level in two categories: 1 - Sexuality and 29 - Equalitarianism (Tables 220 and 223). A significant trend at the .10 level was obtained in category 15 - Community Provision (Table 222). The overall pattern and frequency indicated is similar to that noted in the first administration with a somewhat greater stress on aspects of specific and concrete areas of concern and adjustment, i.e., 1 - Sexuality and 15 - Community Provision in place of emphasis on more theoretical topics, i.e., 16 - Emotional-Social Behavior or 28 - Automony of the Child.

TABLE 220

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF
AMR SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP
FOR THE SECOND TESTING PERIOD (MOTHERS N=31)

Category 1 Sexuality

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	8.21	2.74	3	3.46	**
Within	21.40	.79	27		
Total	29.61		30		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 221

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF AMR SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE SECOND TESTING PERIOD (MOTHERS N=31) (CONT)

Category 5 Dependency

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	50.75	16.92	3	5.91	***
Within	77.35	2.86	27		
Total	128.10		30		

TABLE 222

Category 15 Community Provision

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	7.05	2.35	3	2.73	*
Within	23.10	.86	27		
Total	30.15		30		

TABLE 223

Category 29 Equalitarianism

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	4.88	1.63	3	4.07	**
Within	10.77	.40	27		
Total	15.65		30		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

(3) Administration III

No significant differences at either the .01 or the .05 level were found on AMR scores for the full population of the four counseling treatment groups on the third administration. Trends at the .10 level were found in two categories: 9 - Peer Interaction and 23 - Deification (Tables 224 and 225).

TABLE 224

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF AMR SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE THIRD TESTING PERIOD (N=52)

Category 9 Peer Interaction

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	9.60	3.20	3	2.54	*
Within	60.60	1.26	48		
Total	70.20		51		

TABLE 225

Category 23 Deification

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	7.21	2.40	3	2.23	*
Within	51.91	1.08	48		
Total	59.12		51		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

Thus, minimal variation exists between the four clinic groups on the AMR variables at the end of the project. It seems that the effect of the counseling plus the 6-9 months "saturation" period for the incorporation of concepts has created this change toward relative homogeneity of the experimental population. It is interesting to note that the greatest variation on AMR scores appears at Administration II immediately following the counseling experience. It is conceivable that some of the variation shown at Administration II is of a temporary nature and that the lower frequency of significance at Test III reflects a return to patterns of adjustment initially present. This may reflect the inability of the subjects to consistently apply concepts in life situations to which they had been exposed.

The father sub-group showed no significant variability on Administration III scores at the .01 level; one area of significance at the .05 level, category 3 - Appearance (Table 226); and two areas displaying trends at the .10 level, categories 9 - Peer Interaction, and 12 - Comprehension of Self and others (Tables 227 and 228).

TABLE 226

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF
AMR SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP
FOR THE THIRD TESTING PERIOD (FATHERS N=21)

Category 3 Appearance

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	2.17	.72	3	4.52	**
Within	2.69	.16	17		
Total	4.86		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 227

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF AMR SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE THIRD TESTING PERIOD (FATHERS N=21)

(CONT)

Category 9 Peer Interaction

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	16.31	5.44	3	2.52	*
Within	36.67	2.16	17		
Total	52.98		20		

TABLE 228

Category 12 Comprehension of Self and others

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	13.93	4.64	3	2.96	*
Within	26.76	1.57	17		
Total	40.69		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

In contrast to the pattern shown for the combined experimental group, the male sub-group shows slightly more variation at Administration III in contrast to Test II. The occurrence of variability is at the same proportion and levels as for the pre-counseling administration. One of the categories showing significant variation, 9 - Peer Interaction, appears at both periods though at a less critical level in Administration III. While the other two pairs of categories differ specifically, they are essentially concerned with the same general areas - behavior and interactive patterns of the retardate. As noted, the pattern of variation over the three test administrations for the fathers shows the reverse tendency to that of the total experimental group. The amount and areas of variation at test periods I and III are roughly the same and represent the maximum variability noted for this sub-group on the comparison of AMR items as no significant variation is noted at Administration II.

Conceivably the counseling experience has a somewhat different immediate effect upon the total experimental male population in that it diminishes heterogeneity. With the passage of time minimal variation returns in the same or related areas. Possibly, the somewhat different type of topics exhibiting this variability in this group would account for the different dynamic pattern at the different periods.

The female sub-group showed significant variation on only one category on the third administration of the AMR: category 16 - Emotional-Social Behavior at the .05 level (Table 229). No further differences at the .01 levels were obtained.

TABLE 229

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF
AMR SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP
FOR THE THIRD TESTING PERIOD (MOTHERS N=31)

Category 16 Emotional-Social Behavior

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	40.40	13.47	3	3.33	**
Within	108.97	4.04	27		
Total	149.37		30		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

This represents a reduction of variation in this sub-group from Administrations II and I. This particular category shows significant variation on the pretest at the same level (.05) but does not appear as significant at any level on Test II. Thus, counseling seems to consistently influence a cohesiveness of attitude patterns relating to retardation in the mother sub-group.

These patterns suggest that the heterogeneity of the group essentially decreases throughout the post-counseling period. As has been noted, this general pattern holds true for the total experimental group and the female sub-group, but different dynamics seem to govern the male patterns. Further consideration will be given to this aspect in subsequent discussions and most particularly in Question 7.

The general patterns noted here in terms of frequency of variation for the total group and the two derivative groups seem to be generally borne out in the consideration of the PARI data presented previously.

Counseling influences the structure of attitudes toward retardation. In general, the content focus shifts toward a predominant focus on concern for the individual, his expression and self-realization. Counseling tends to create more consistency within the experimental group on these patterns.

D. Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC): Variable Scores

(1) Administration I

On the analysis of variance treatment of the GSC Variable scores for the first testing period for the four clinic groups, significant variability was found at the .05 level for two categories, 15 - Integrity and 19 - Nurturance (Tables 231 and 233). Trends at the .10 level were noted in two additional areas; 13 - Dominance, and 17 - Irritability (Tables 230 and 232). No differences at the .01 level were obtained.

TABLE 230

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF GSC VARIABLE SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE FIRST TESTING PERIOD (N=52)

Category 13 Dominance

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	4.93	1.64	3	2.25	*
Within	34.97	.73	48		
Total	39.90		51		

TABLE 231

Category 15 Integrity

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	2.59	.86	3	2.88	**
Within	14.58	.30	48		
Total	17.17		51		

TABLE 232

Category 17 Irritability

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.36	.45	3	2.39	*
Within	9.29	.19	48		
Total	10.65		51		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 233

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF GSC . VARIABLE SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE FIRST TESTING PERIOD (N=52) (CONT)

Category 19 Nurturance

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	23.84	7.95	3	2.92	**
Within	130.45	2.72	48		
Total	154.29		51		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

The significant categories represent rather divergent areas. Both the personal concept and adjustment of the parent (15 - Integrity and 17 - Irritability) and the aspects more directly related to parental behavior regarding children (19 - Nurturance and 13 - Dominance) show variability.

Both the frequency and criticalness of the significant variability within the experimental group on GSC Variable scores on the pre-test are less than that found on the similar comparison for the full project population in Question 3. Here again, this experimental group seems to be slightly more initially homogeneous than the larger population from which it was drawn. A similar pattern is noted on the PARI scores while the reverse is true for the AMR. Perhaps the more generalized content areas dealt with by both the PARI and the GSC in contrast to the specific reference to retardation on the AMR accounts for these trends.

The male sub-group of the experimental population showed significant initial variation at the .01 level for category 12 - Description (Table 235). No differences appeared at the .05 level. The only area approaching significance at the .10 level was category 11 - Deference (Table 234).

TABLE 234

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF
GSC VARIABLE SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP
FOR THE FIRST TESTING PERIOD (FATHERS N=21)

Category 11 Deference

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	2.24	.75	3	2.49	*
Within	5.13	.30	17		
Total	7.37		20		

TABLE 235

Category 12 Description

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	22.70	7.57	3	5.60	***
Within	23.03	1.35	17		
Total	45.73		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

It is noted that the significant variability is concerned essentially with non-emotionalized responses. This coincides with other observations made for the male sub-group in that the frequency of more objectively or intellectually oriented areas is greater than in the total or the female sub-group.

This minimal occurrence of initial variation for the male experimental subject is somewhat less than that noted for the same sub-group of the full study population in Question 3. Here again, a suggestion that the experimental population represents a select, less variable segment on some measures is indicated.

Category 31 - Submissiveness (Table 239) showed significant variation at the .05 level within the experimental female group on consideration of Administration I of the GSC Variable scores. Three variables showed differences at the .10 level: 13 - Dominance, 16 - Intellectualism, and 17 - Irritability (Tables 236, 237 and 238). No significance was noted at the .01 level. The mothers show a greater tendency than previously noted to display variation on more personally oriented items related to dominant submissive behavior.

TABLE 236

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF GSC VARIABLE SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE FIRST TESTING PERIOD (MOTHERS N=31)

Category 13 Dominance

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	9.97	3.32	3	2.94	
Within	30.45	1.13	27		
Total	40.42		30		

TABLE 237

Category 16 Intellectualism

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	12.79	4.26	3	2.33	*
Within	49.47	1.83	27		
Total	62.26		30		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 238

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF GSC . VARIABLE SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE FIRST TESTING PERIOD (MOTHERS N=31) (CONT)

Category 17 Irritability

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	2.01	.67	3	2.31	*
Within	7.77	.29	27		
Total	9.78		30		

TABLE 239

Category 31 Submissiveness

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.36	.45	3	3.02	**
Within	4.18	.15	27		
Total	5.54		30		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

(2) Administration II

Significance at the .05 level was obtained in four of the 35 category variables on the analysis of variance of the post-counseling (II) GSC data: categories 2 - Achievement, 3 - Acquiescence, 9 - Benignness and 25 - Play (Tables 240, 241, 244, and 246). Trends at the .10 level were noted in four categories: 4 - Acquisition, 8 - Avoidance, 22 - order, and 31 - Submissiveness (Tables 242, 243, 245, and 247). No differences were obtained at the more critical .01 level.

TABLE 240

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF GSC . VARIABLE SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE SECOND TESTING PERIOD (N=52)

Category 2 Achievement

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	26.82	8.94	3	3.19	**
Within	134.57	2.80	48		
Total	161.39		51		

TABLE 241

Category 3 Acquiescence

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	16.38	5.46	3	3.90	**
Within	66.96	1.40	48		
Total	83.34		51		

TABLE 242

Category 4 Acquisition

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.81	.60	3	2.32	*
Within	12.68	.26	48		
Total	14.49		51		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 243

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF GSC VARIABLE SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE SECOND TESTING PERIOD (N=52)

(CONT)

Category 8 Avoidance

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.24	.41	3	2.30	*
Within	8.60	.18	48		
Total	9.84		51		

TABLE 244

Category 9 Benignness

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	11.49	3.83	3	3.61	**
Within	50.92	1.06	48		
Total	62.41		51		

TABLE 245

Category 22 Order

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.94	.65	3	2.40	*
Within	13.05	.27	48		
Total	14.99		51		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 246

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF GSC. VARIABLE SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE SECOND TESTING PERIOD (N=52) (CONT)

Category 25 Play

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	4.91	1.64	3	2.98	**
Within	26.51	.55	48		
Total	31.42		51		

TABLE 247

Category 31 Submissiveness

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	.20	.07	3	2.22	*
Within	1.38	.03	48		
Total	1.58		51		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

A definite increase of significant variation within the experimental group on the post-counseling administration of the GSC is observed. None of the specific categories exhibiting significance at Administration I are repeated at this point. Variation seems to have increased in areas concerned with material or concrete aspects, i.e., 2 - Achievement, 4 - Acquisition, 25 - Play and in passive and avoidant category areas, i.e., 9 - Benignness and 3 - Acquiescence in contrast to those more concerned with aggressive and outgoing patterns. Counseling tends to diminish variation in some areas and create it in others for the experimental population on personality need variables measured by the GSC.

Variation at Administration II increased for the male sub-group. Significant differences at the .05 level were derived in two category variables; 1 - Abasement and 4 - Acquisition (Tables 248 and 249). Significant trends at the .10 level were also found in two categories, 9 - Benignness and 22 - order (Tables 250 and 251). No differences appeared at the .01 level. There is an indication of variation in both the personalized areas related to passive and acquiescent modes of behavior and the more concrete oriented areas.

TABLE 248

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF
GSC . VARIABLE SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP
FOR THE SECOND TESTING PERIOD (FATHERS N=21)

Category 1 Abasement

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.73	.58	3	3.20	**
Within	3.14	.18	17		
Total	4.87		20		

TABLE 249

Category 4 Acquisition

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	6.60	2.20	3	3.61	**
Within	10.31	.61	17		
Total	16.91		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 250

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF GSC. VARIABLE SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE SECOND TESTING PERIOD (FATHERS N=21)
(CONT)

Category 9 Benignness

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	33.28	11.09	3	2.79	*
Within	67.50	3.97	17		
Total	100.78		20		

TABLE 251

Category 22 order

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	4.13	1.38	3	2.93	*
Within	8.01	.47	17		
Total	12.14	.	20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

Specific variation existing at Administration I seems to have been significantly reduced by the counseling experience as neither significant category is repeated at Test II. At the same time counseling seems to have contributed to the appearance of some significant variability in four additional categories having a primarily passive emphasis. This pattern of slight increase and change in variability patterns is similar to that noted for the full experimental group comparison at this point. It is a somewhat reverse trend to that manifested by this same male sub-group on both the PARI and AMR scores. Perhaps the more specific involvement of individual personality variables on the GSC contributes to this difference.

The female sub-group showed significant variation on the post-counseling GSC variables in one instance at the .05 level, category 33 - Supernaturalism (Table 253). Trends at the .10 level were obtained in category 23 - Pessimism (Table 252). No differences at the .01 level were reached.

TABLE 252

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF GSC . VARIABLE SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE SECOND TESTING PERIOD (MOTHERS N=31)

Category 23 Pessimism

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	.07	.02	3	2.33	*
Within	.34	.01	27		
Total	.41		30		

TABLE 253

Category 33 Supernaturalism

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	4.62	1.54	3	3.95	**
Within	10.48	.39	27		
Total	15.10		30		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

None of the category variables which are significant on the pretest remain significant on the post-counseling data. The areas showing significance on Test II are more directly related to causation and outcomes of actions than the more personalized yielding and reactive areas previously noted. The slight tendency for variability to decrease on this second administration is in contrast to the opposite pattern noted for both the total experimental group and the male sub-group. It, however, is fairly consistent with the pattern shown for this female sub-group on both the PARI and AMR.

Variation does not appear on the same variables for the male and female sub-groups. Nor does the total experimental group analysis seem to necessarily reflect the areas of major variation in either of these subgroups.

(3) Administration III

Significant differences among the four clinic treatment groups on the third administration of the GSC were noted at the .01 level in one category, 15 - Integrity (Table 257), at the .05 level in five categories: 10 - Counteraction, 14 - Identification, 17 - Irritability 22 - Order, and 34 - Understanding (Tables 255, 256 259, 260, and 262), and at the .10 level in three: 3 - Acquiescence, 16 - Intellectualism, and 31 - Submissiveness (Tables 254, 258, and 261).

TABLE 254

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF GSG . VARIABLE SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE THIRD TESTING PERIOD (N=52)

Category 3 Acquiescence

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	13.36	4.45	3	2.64	*
Within	80.91	1.69	48		
Total	94.27		51		

TABLE 255

Category 10 Counteraction

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	.88	.29	3	3.26	**
Within	4.32	.09	48		
Total	5.20		51		

TABLE 256

Category 14 Identification

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	2.71	.90	3	2.91	**
Within	15.06	.31	48		
Total	17.77		51		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 257

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF GSC . VARIABLE SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE THIRD TESTING PERIOD (N=52)
(CONT)

Category 15 Integrity

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	3.01	1.00	3	4.56	***
Within	10.77	.22	48		
Total	13.78		51		

TABLE 258

Category 16 Intellectualism

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	5.98	1.98	3	2.32	*
Within	41.43	.86	48		
Total	47.41		51		

TABLE 259

Category 17 Irritability

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	3.55	1.18	3	3.82	**
Within	14.76	.31	48		
Total	18.31		51		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 260

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF GSC . VARIABLE SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE THIRD TESTING PERIOD (N=52)
(CONT)

Category 22 Order

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	3.12	1.04	3	3.71	**
Within	13.60	.28	48		
Total	16.72		51		

TABLE 261

Category 31 Submissiveness

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	.54	.18	3	3.00	*
Within	3.05	.06	48		
Total	3.59		51		

TABLE 262

Category 34 Understanding

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	7.04	2.35	3	3.67	**
Within	30.49	.64	48		
Total	37.53		51		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

This represents a substantial increase in the frequency of variation among the four counseling groups from the first administration and slightly more in contrast to the post-counseling set of scores. Somewhat more significance is apparent at both the .01 and .05 levels.

In a number of instances there is replication of significance in categories with either of the previous test periods 3 - Acquiescence III (.10) and II (.05), 22 - Order III (.05) and II (.10), and 31 - Submissiveness (.10) and II (.10); 16 - Intellectualism III (.10) and I (.10), 17 - Irritability III, (.05) and I (.10), 31 - Submissiveness III (.10) and I (.05). Category 31 - Submissiveness is the only sub-scale which maintains significant variation for all three test periods. In some instances initial variation is diminished by counseling only to reappear after a period of no contact, and in some others, change which occurs after counseling is sustained. Areas showing significant variation at Administration III are related to personal adjustment patterns, goals and intellectual attitudes. This pattern is fairly consistent with that seen for the group on the preceding administration.

The overall increase of the occurrence of variation on this administration is the first time this trend is noted for the experimental group. Counseling and the post-counseling period has an additive as well as a selective effect in increasing intra-group variability on the GSC need personality variables.

The father sub-group of the experimental population showed no significant variation on an analysis of variance of Administration III GSC scores at the .01 level. Significance was found on three categories at the .05 level: 14 - Identification 15 - Integrity, and 22 - Order (Tables 266, 267, and 269); and in five at the .10 level: categories 1 - Abasement, 4 - Acquisition, 9 - Benignness, 21 - Optimism and 34 - Understanding (Tables 263, 264, 265, 268 and 270).

TABLE 263

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF GSG. VARIABLE SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE THIRD TESTING PERIOD (FATHERS N=21)

Category 1 Abasement

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.67	.56	3	2.93	*
Within	3.19	.19	17		
Total	4.86		20		

TABLE 264

Category 4 Acquisition

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	7.40	2.47	3	2.90	*
Within	14.52	.85	17		
Total	21.92		20		

TABLE 265

Category 9 Benignness

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	31.73	10.58	3	2.65	*
Within	67.76	3.99	17		
Total	99.49		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 266

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF GSC. VARIABLE SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE THIRD TESTING PERIOD (FATHERS N=21)
(CONT)

Category 14 Identification

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	10.00	3.33	3	4.83	**
Within	11.70	.69	17		
Total	21.70		20		

TABLE 267

Category 15 Integrity

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	6.74	2.25	3	3.26	**
Within	11.73	.69	17		
Total	18.47		20		

TABLE 268

Category 21 Optimism

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	2.91	.97	3	3.03	*
Within	5.39	.32	17		
Total	8.30		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 269

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF GSC. VARIABLE SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE THIRD TESTING PERIOD (FATHERS N=21) (CONT)

Category 22 Order

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	5.71	1.90	3	4.53	**
Within	7.09	.42	17		
Total	12.80		20		

TABLE 270

Category 34 Understanding

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	9.06	3.02	3	2.99	*
Within	17.19	1.01	17		
Total	26.25		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

These findings indicate an increase in variability for the male sub-group over the periods of counseling and post-counseling. All four category variables (Tables 248 - 251) which were significant at any of the designated levels on Test II are found maintained in Test III. Neither of the two significant categories on the initial administration are repeated on this administration. Here again, counseling seems to have created a change and increase in the specific areas showing variation within this sub-group from an emphasis on non-emotionalized responses to greater concern for topics related to self-understanding and appropriate modes of behavior. This pattern is similar to that for this sub-group on the PARI and AMR scores on both Tests I and II. However, the increase in frequency over the three test administrations is not borne out in a surface perusal of the patterns of the other two instruments as they both show more initial variation in contrast.

In the comparison of the female experimental sub-group, two categories were significant at the .01 level: 17 - Irritability and 33 - Supernaturalism (Tables 272 and 275). Significance at the .05 level was found in two additional areas; 3 - Acquiescence and 31 - Submissiveness (Tables 271 and 274). Trends at the .10 level were noted in categories 28 - Seclusion and 34 - Understanding (Tables 273 and 276).

TABLE 271

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF
GSC. VARIABLE SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP
FOR THE THIRD TESTING PERIOD (MOTHERS N=31)

Category 3 Acquiescence

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	29.77	9.92	3	3.73	**
Within	71.90	2.66	27		
Total	101.67		30		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 272

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF GSC VARIABLE SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE THIRD TESTING PERIOD (MOTHERS N=31)
(CONT)

Category 17 Irritability

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	9.56	3.19	3	6.25	***
Within	13.88	.51	27		
Total	23.44		30		

TABLE 273

Category 28 Seclusion

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	.50	.17	3	2.38	*
Within	1.88	.07	27		
Total	2.38		30		

TABLE 274

Category 31 Submissiveness

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.36	.45	3	3.02	**
Within	4.18	.15	27		
Total	5.54		30		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 275

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF GSC VARIABLE SCORES FOR THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE THIRD TESTING PERIOD (MOTHERS N=31) (CONT)

Category 33 Supernaturalism

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	8.04	2.68	3	6.38	***
Within	11.45	.42	27		
Total	19.49		30		

TABLE 276

Category 34 Understanding

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	10.12	3.37	3	2.46	*
Within	36.87	1.37	27		
Total	46.99		30		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

There is a definite increase in variability within the mother segment of the experimental group over the post-counseling period. The frequency of variability observed is also greater than that existing at the time of the pre-test.

Areas showing significant variation within the group are predominantly those of a highly personalized nature related to acquiescent and disturbing behavior as well as concern over supernatural explanations in terms of individual adjustment. Two variables reaching significance on Administration I are repeated at Administration III: 7 - Irritability III (.01) and I (.10) and 31 - Submissiveness III (.05) and I (.05). One category showing significant variation on Test III is also found on Test II: 33 - Supernaturalism III (.01) and II (.05). There seems to be a tendency for counseling to alter some patterns temporarily and others more permanently.

In contrast to the father sub-group on GSC variable scores, the mothers tend to become less variable immediately after counseling but then surpass their original level after a time lapse, whereas the fathers show a steady increase in variability over the three test periods. This pattern is also dissimilar from that shown by the mothers on either the PARI or the AMR scores where they exhibit a general diminution of variability.

D. Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC): Direction Scores.

No significant differences among the four experimental groups were noted on Administration I or II of the GSC Direction Scores for the full group or either of the two sex sub-groups. For the third testing period, one trend toward significant variation at the .10 level was obtained for the mother segment on category 1 - Positive (Table 277). In this one instance, unusual variation exists among the female population on the frequency of positively oriented responses.

TABLE 277

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF .GSC. DIRECTION SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE THIRD TESTING PERIOD (MOTHERS N=31)

Category 1 Positive

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	489.74	163.25	3	2.38	*
Within	1852.01	68.59	27		
Total	2341.75		30		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

E. Stern Activities Index (SAI)

(1) Administration I

The analysis of variance of the scores from the initial administration of the SAI with the total experimental group yielded significant variation at the .01 level in two of the 40 category variables; 10 - Order and 15 - Reflectiveness (Tables 278 and 280). No differences were obtained at the .05 level. Three additional variables showed at the .10 level: 11 - Harmavoidance, 19 - Affilitation, and 20 - Nurturance (Tables 279, 281 and 282). The personality variables showing initial variation relate to the social adaptiveness of the individual, introspectiveness and general patterns of adjustment.

TABLE 278

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SAI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE FIRST TESTING PERIOD (N=52)

Category 10 Order

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	11.12	3.71	3	8.24	***
Within	21.54	.45	48		
Total	32.66		51		

TABLE 279

Category 11 Harmavoidance

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	2.75	.92	3	2.41	*
Within	18.20	.38	48		
Total	20.95		51		

TABLE 280

Category 15 Reflectiveness

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	6.57	2.19	3	4.98	***
Within	21.01	.44	48		
Total	27.58		51		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 281

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SAI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE FIRST TESTING PERIOD (N=52) (CONT)

Category 19 Affiliation

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	3.01	1.00	3	2.79	*
Within	17.25	.36	48		
Total	20.26		51		

TABLE 282

Category 20 Nurturance

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.46	.49	3	2.56	*
Within	9.08	.19	48		
Total	10.54		51		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

There is for SAI scores also, slightly less initial variation for this experimental segment than for the full study population as reported in Question 3.

The male segment of the experimental group exhibited no initial variation on SAI scores at the .01 level of significance. Seven categories reached significance at the .05 level; category 5 - Energy, 10 - Order, 12 - Understanding 17 - Scientism, 19 - Affiliation, 25 - Narcissism, and 35 - Autonomy (Tables 283, 284, 286. 287, 288, 289, and 290). Significance at the .10 level was noted in one instance, category 11 - Harmavoidance (Table 285). In this sub-group as for the entire experimental population, variation occurs in a number of dynamic areas including interpersonal relationships, self-concept and patterns of adjustment.

TABLE 283

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SAI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE FIRST TESTING PERIOD (FATHERS N=21)

Category 5 Energy

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	4.44	1.48	3	3.29	**
Within	7.68	.45	17		
Total	12.12		20		

TABLE 284

Category 10 Order

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	17.38	5.79	3	3.91	**
Within	25.15	1.48	17		
Total	42.53		20		

TABLE 285

Category 11 Harmavoidance

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	6.68	2.23	3	2.78	*
Within	13.53	.80	17		
Total	20.21		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 286

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SAI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE FIRST TESTING PERIOD (FATHERS N=21) (CONT)

Category 12 Understanding

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	8.63	2.88	3	4.49	**
Within	10.89	.64	17		
Total	19.52		20		

TABLE 287

Category 17 Scientism

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	14.96	4.99	3	4.53	**
Within	18.78	1.10	17		
Total	33.74		20		

TABLE 288

Category 19 Affiliation

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	8.49	2.83	3	3.63	**
Within	13.19	.78	17		
Total	21.68		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 289

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SAI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE FIRST TESTING PERIOD (FATHERS N=21) (CONT)

Category 25 **Narcissism**

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	6.16	2.05	3	3.54	**
Within	9.79	.58	17		
Total	15.95		20		

TABLE 290

Category 35 Autonomy

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	6.14	2.05	3	4.26	**
Within	8.24	.48	17		
Total	14.38		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

Somewhat more initial variation (especially at the .05 level) is found in this sub-group on SAI scores than for the same comparison for the full study population. This is in contrast to the trend noted for the experimental group as well as the total population (Question 3) and the two sex sub-groups on the other four instruments previously presented. Only one category variable, 10 - Order, is found to be significant on the first test administration for both the full experimental group and the male segment. The other significant categories are unique with the father group.

The female population of the clinic groups showed significant initial variation on the SAI in one instance at the .01 level, category 15 - Reflectiveness (Table 293). Significance at the .05 level was reached in two additional areas, category 10 - Order and 18 - Objectivity (Tables 291 and 294). Category 13 - Counteraction reached significance at the .10 level (Table 292). The same general dynamic content patterns coping with situations and introspective elements are expressed in these categories as those noted for the full group and the male segments.

TABLE 291

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF
SAI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP
FOR THE FIRST TESTING PERIOD (MOTHERS N=31)

Category 10 Order

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	5.92	1.97	3	3.65	**
Within	14.53	.54	27		
Total	20.45		30		

TABLE 292

Category 13 Counteraction

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	3.52	1.17	3	2.30	*
Within	13.78	.51	27		
Total	17.30		30		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 293

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SAI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE FIRST TESTING PERIOD (MOTHERS N=31)
(CONT)

Category 15 Reflectiveness

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	10.03	3.34	3	4.85	***
Within	18.68	.69	27		
Total	28.71		30		

TABLE 294

Category 18 Objectivity

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	6.06	2.02	3	3.21	**
Within	16.95	.63	27		
Total	23.01		30		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

Category 10-Order appears as significantly variable within the female sub-group as it did in the two previous breakdowns of Administration I. Category 15-Reflectiveness also appears as highly significant (.01) for both the experimental group and the female sub-group comparison. Approximately the same degree of variability exists for the experimental group of mothers on SAI test I scores as that found for the larger female population in Question 3. Less selectivity seems to exist in the clinic groups in contrast to the total project sample on the basis of SAI scores than on the other four measures. It is possible that since the SAI is designed to measure personality variables as such, it would be less discriminating on some of the more specific factors reached by some of the other devices which show more differentiation.

(2) Administration II

Significant differences between SAI scores from the second test administration were found in two categories at the .01 level, categories 19 - Affiliation and 34 - Rejection (Tables 297 and 300). Differences at the .05 level were obtained in categories 20 - Nurturance, 22 - Conjunctivity and 36 - Disjunctivity (Tables 298, 299, and 301). Trends significant at the .10 level were noted for categories 10 - Order and 11 - Harmavoidance (Tables 295 and 296).

TABLE 295

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SAI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE SECOND TESTING PERIOD (N=52)

Category 10 Order

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	3.85	1.28	3	2.67	*
Within	22.97	.48	48		
Total	26.82		51		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 296

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SAI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE SECOND TESTING PERIOD (N=52) (CONT)

Category 11 Harmavoidance

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	2.64	.88	3	2.38	*
Within	17.95	.37	48		
Total	20.59		51		

TABLE 297

Category 19 Affiliation

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	4.87	1.62	3	5.24	***
Within	14.70	.31	48		
Total	19.57		51		

TABLE 298

Category 20 Nurturance

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.87	.62	3	2.97	**
Within	10.21	.21	48		
Total	12.08		51		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 299
SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SAI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE SECOND TESTING PERIOD (N=52)
(CONT)

Category 22 Conjunctivity

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.80	.60	3	2.86	**
Within	9.93	.21	48		
Total	11.73		51		

TABLE 300

Category 34 Rejection

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	3.13	1.04	3	6.52	***
Within	7.85	.16	48		
Total	10.98		51		

TABLE 301

Category 36 Disjunctivity

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	1.80	.60	3	2.86	**
Within	9.93	.21	48		
Total	11.73		51		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

There is a slight increase in the amount of variation on SAI scores from the pre-counseling to the post-counseling administration. Areas in which significant variation appears are similar to those for the initial test in several instances; categories 10 - Order, 11 - Harmavoidance 19 - Affiliation and 20 - Nurturance. Evidently the counseling treatment does not appreciably alter the patterns existing in these areas of personality adjustment. Other variability occurring at this point is primarily concerned with personal and affiliative relationships.

The father sub-group also showed increased significant variability on the SAI post-counseling scores. Significance at the .01 level was obtained in three categories, 11 - Harmavoidance 19 - Affiliation, and 34 - Rejection (Tables 303, 306 and 311). Differences at the .05 level of significance were noted in categories 12 - Understanding 17 - Scientism and 25 - Narcissism (Tables 304 305 and 309). Trends at the .10 level of significance were found in categories 10 - Order, 20 - Nurturance, 21 - Succorance 29 - Impulsion 35 - Autonomy and 39 - Deliberation (Tables 302, 307, 308, 310, 312, and 313).

TABLE 302

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SAI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE SECOND TESTING PERIOD (FATHERS N=21)

Category 10 Order

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	13.08	4.36	3	2.63	*
Within	28.26	1.66	17		
Total	41.34		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 303

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SAI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE SECOND TESTING PERIOD (FATHERS N=21) (CONT)

Category 11 Harmavoidance

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	10.20	3.40	3	5.31	***
Within	10.95	.64	17		
Total	21.15		20		

TABLE 304

Category 12 Understanding

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	10.36	3.45	3	4.93	**
Within	11.88	.70	17		
Total	22.24		20		

TABLE 305

Category 17 Scientism

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	15.10	5.03	3	3.84	**
Within	22.19	1.31	17		
Total	37.29		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability

**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability

***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 306

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SAI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE SECOND TESTING PERIOD (FATHERS N=21) (CONT)

Category 19 Affiliation

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	11.77	3.92	3	5.94	***
Within	11.24	.66	17		
Total	23.01		20		

TABLE 307

Category 20 Nurturance

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	2.94	.98	3	2.45	*
Within	6.73	.40	17		
Total	9.67		20		

TABLE 308

Category 21 Succorance

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	7.16	2.39	3	3.02	*
Within	13.41	.79	17		
Total	20.57		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 309

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SAI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE SECOND TESTING PERIOD (FATHERS N=21) (CONT)

Category 25 **Narcissism**

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	5.96	1.99	3	3.37	**
Within	10.02	.59	17		
Total	15.98		20		

TABLE 310

Category 29 Impulsion

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	4.57	1.52	3	2.54	*
Within	10.21	.60	17		
Total	14.78		20		

TABLE 311

Category 34 Rejection

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	7.79	2.60	3	14.43	***
Within	3.12	.18	17		
Total	10.91		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 312

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SAI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE SECOND TESTING PERIOD (FATHERS N=21) (CONT)

Category 35 Autonomy

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	7.16	2.39	3	3.02	*
Within	13.41	.79	17		
Total	20.57		20		

TABLE 313

Category 39 Deliberation

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	4.57	1.52	3	2.54	*
Within	10.21	.60	17		
Total	14.78		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

Here again, significant variability noted on test I is maintained in this second set of data in category 10 - Order, 11 - Harmavoidance, 12 - Understanding 17 - Scientism, 19 - Affiliation, and 25 - Narcissism. Counseling does not seem to significantly decrease heterogeneity within the clinic group fathers in these areas. Counseling would seem to have decreased homogeneity which initially existed in some areas at the pre-counseling test period.

The female experimental sub-group attained variability on considerably fewer SAI categories than did the total experimental group or the male segment on Test II. Differences reaching significance at the .01 level were obtained in category 19 - Affiliation (Table 315), and at the .05 level in categories 8 - Abasement and 34 - Rejection (Tables 314 and 316). No differences at the .10 level were found.

TABLE 314

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SAI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE SECOND TESTING PERIOD (MOTHERS N=31)

Category 8 Abasement

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	2.32	.77	3	3.09	**
Within	6.86	.25	27		
Total	9.18		30		

TABLE 315

Category 19 Affiliation

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	8.56	2.85	3	6.79	***
Within	11.27	.42	27		
Total	19.83		30		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 316

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SAI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE SECOND TESTING PERIOD (MOTHERS N=31) (CONT)

Category 34 Rejection

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	3.85	1.28	3	3.89	**
Within	8.88	.33	27		
Total	12.73		30		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

The female group shows more alterability in that no specific categories reflecting intra-group variability on Administration I appear to be consistently stable on Administration II. New variation appears in three categories.

In contrast to the males and the full group, the female subgroup shows variation in fewer categories on this post-counseling comparison. There is also a minimal decrease of variability, whereas the other two comparison groups show an increase.

(3) Administration III

The Test III SAI scores of the experimental group yielded statistically significant differences at the .01 level in one case: category 10 - Order (Table 317); none at the .05 level; and three trends at the .10 level: categories 19 - Affiliation, 21 - Succorance, and 35 - Autonomy (Tables 318, 319, 320). These differences reflect an appreciable diminution of intra-group variability on the need personality variables measured by the SAI from the data obtained immediately after counseling and to a lesser degree from the initial administration.

TABLE 317

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SAI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE THIRD TESTING PERIOD (N=52)

Category 10 Order

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	7.67	2.56	3	4.65	***
Within	26.53	.55	48		
Total	34.20		51		

TABLE 318

Category 19 Affiliation

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	3.20	1.07	3	2.60	*
Within	19.71	.41	48		
Total	22.91		51		

TABLE 319

Category 21 Succorance

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	2.54	.85	3	2.29	*
Within	17.94	.37	48		
Total	20.48		51		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 320

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SAI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE THIRD TESTING PERIOD (N=52) (CONT)

Category 35 Autonomy

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	2.53	.84	3	2.28	*
Within	17.94	.37	48		
Total	20.47		51		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

Of the categories showing significance at this point, two, 10 - Order and 19 - Affiliation appear at one of the designated critical levels at all three administration periods. It would seem that either counseling did not encompass areas directly related to these variables or that such influences were ineffectual in creating any noteworthy alteration of need personality patterns. A similar assumption can be made for the several category variables not displaying intra-group heterogeneity at any point in the consideration.

The general pattern noted then for the four clinic groups on SAI scores seems to indicate an initially moderate degree of heterogeneity, an appreciable increase in variability immediately following the termination of the counseling experience, and a general tapering off to a level similar to that initially noted, after a 6-9 months period of time. Some of the counseling effect is maintained; some is not. The overall picture from SAI data indicates change as a more immediate effect of the counseling experience with a minimal or diminished effect after the lapse of time.

Whether these patterns are contributed equally by all four of the clinic groups will be further explored in later questions. At this stage it can only be noted that variation within the total experimental group on SAI scores increases with counseling, only to decrease to its former rate within a 6-9 months period after the termination of counseling.

In contrast, the male sub-group maintained roughly the same frequency and pattern of significant variability after the 6-9 months post-counseling period (III) as at Test II. Significant differences were found at the .01 level in category 17 - Scientism (Table 324); at the .05 level in categories 10 - Order, 11 - Harmavoidance, 19 - Affiliation, 23 - Aggression, 27 - Ego Achievement and 37 - Blameavoidance (Tables 321, 322, 325, 326, 329, and 331): and at the .10 level in categories 12 - Understanding, 24 - Dominance, 26 - Fantasied Achievement, and 34 - Rejection (Tables 323, 327, 328, and 330).

TABLE 321

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF
SAI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP
FOR THE THIRD TESTING PERIOD (FATHERS N=21)

Category 10 Order

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	17.37	5.79	3	4.11	**
Within	24.02	1.41	17		
Total	41.39		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 322

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SAI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE THIRD TESTING PERIOD (FATHERS N=21)
(CONT)

Category 11 Harmavoidance

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	8.61	2.87	3	3.59	**
Within	13.65	.80	17		
Total	22.26		20		

TABLE 323

Category 12 Understanding

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	8.03	2.68	3	2.85	*
Within	16.05	.94	17		
Total	24.08		20		

TABLE 324

Category 17 Scientism

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	20.16	6.72	3	5.74	***
Within	19.84	1.17	17		
Total	40.00		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 325

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SAI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE THIRD TESTING PERIOD (FATHERS N=21) (CONT)

Category 19 Affiliation

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	10.34	3.45	3	4.10	**
Within	14.29	.84	17		
Total	24.63		20		

TABLE 326

Category 23 Aggression

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	5.21	1.74	3	4.57	**
Within	6.54	.38	17		
Total	11.75		20		

TABLE 327

Category 24 Dominance

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	5.72	1.91	3	2.98	*
Within	10.84	.64	17		
Total	16.56		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 328

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SAI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE THIRD TESTING PERIOD (FATHERS N=21) (CONT)

Category 26 Fantasied Achievement

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	6.69	2.23	3	2.45	*
Within	15.45	.91	17		
Total	22.14		20		

TABLE 329

Category 27 Ego Achievement

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	8.44	2.81	3	4.14	**
Within	11.53	.68	17		
Total	19.97		20		

TABLE 330

Category 34 Rejection

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	4.53	1.51	3	3.08	*
Within	8.25	.49	17		
Total	12.78		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

TABLE 331

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SAI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE THIRD TESTING PERIOD (FATHERS N=21) (CONT)

Category 37 **Blameavoidance**

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	5.21	1.74	3	4.57	**
Within	6.54	.38	17		
Total	11.75		20		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

As in Administration II for the men, several of the significant categories were carried over on Test III. The two Achievement categories (26 and 27) represent the only new area of variability.

A similar pattern for the maintenance or increase of variability from Administration II to III is noted for this male sub-group and the full group on GSC variable scores although more shift in specific areas was apparent there. The personality variables measured by the SAI, and to some extent the GSC, are of a more basic and generalized nature than the more specific and specialized content areas on the PARI and especially the AMR. It is conceivable that changes in these more basic personality patterns as measured by the SAI and GSC are more permanent and irreversible by time than the more specific and isolated topic areas.

The female sub-group showed minimal variation on Test III of the SAI within the four clinic groups. Significance was reached at the .05 level in category 19 - Affiliation (Table 332) and at the .10 level in category 34 - Rejection (Table 333). No differences were significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 332

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SAI SCORES OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUP FOR THE THIRD TESTING PERIOD (MOTHERS N=31)

Category 19 Affiliation

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	6.02	2.01	3	2.99	**
Within	18.14	.67	27		
Total	24.16		30		

TABLE 333

Category 34 Rejection

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	df	F	P
Between	3.49	1.16	3	2.91	*
Within	10.74	.40	27		
Total	14.23		30		

*Significant at or less than the .10 level of probability
**Significant at or less than the .05 level of probability
***Significant at or less than the .01 level of probability

An examination of the data indicates that the mother sub-group shows little change either in frequency or in the areas exhibiting intra-group heterogeneity from one testing period to the other. Any noticeable change which occurs is noted from the pre-counseling (I) to the post-counseling battery (II) in terms of different specific category variables. Thus, in contrast to the male and the total clinic group comparison, the female sub-group seems to be minimally affected by counseling on variables measured by the SAI. In addition, during the post-counseling period variation noted at Test II is somewhat minimized. Some dynamic sex differences may be operating here and in other situations where discrepancies are noted. These factors will be further considered in a later comparison (Question 7).

In analyzing the differences for the three test periods on each of the measures, certain gross patterns of variability are observed within the experimental group (Cazenovia, Minnowbrook, Twice a Month, and Once a Month). In this consideration, it is not known the extent to which the composition and treatment of the clinic groups contributes to the variation. In general, a tendency for the frequency of intra-experimental group variability to increase immediately after counseling (Test II) is noted on the AMR, the GSC, and the SAI. This pattern maintains itself or increases over the 6-9 months post-counseling period (GSC) but tends to decrease again with the passage of time (AMR and SAI). The PARI scores for the experimental group show a different pattern in that variability consistently decreases over the three test administrations. This general pattern is also noted for the female sub-group on PARI, AMR, and SAI scores. On the GSC, this sub-group shows a decrease in variability immediately following counseling with an increase which surpasses the pre-counseling ratio present at Administration III.

The male sub-group shows a varied pattern for the different instruments. An increase in frequency of variability occurs with each successive administration of the GSC. On the SAI, variability also increases after counseling (Test II) but maintains roughly the same frequency on Test III. On the AMR and PARI, variability decreases immediately following the counseling but shifts back to near its pre-counseling level after the 6-9 months no-contact period.

Throughout this comparison there are fewer differences which reach significance at the .01 level. Differences at the less critical .05 and .10 levels are more common.

Variation within the experimental group appears at all three testing periods. Although there is initial variation within the group, the change which occurs with counseling over the three test periods is greater than that which might be expected by chance. The greatest change occurs on generalized attitudes toward child-rearing practices (PARI), specific attitudes toward retardation (AMR), and the need personality variables (GSC). The shift in dynamic content areas occurs more frequently on the PARI and AMR. Counseling seems to influence a change in general and specific attitudes and some areas of need personality structure.

QUESTION 6. WHAT IS THE EFFECT OF A "CONCENTRATED" VERSUS A "DISTRIBUTED" COUNSELING PERIOD UPON THE ATTITUDES AND NEED PERSONALITY STRUCTURE OF PARENTS OF EDUCABLE MENTALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN?

The two Concentrated clinic groups (Cazenovia and Minnowbrook) received their six counseling sessions over a relatively short period of time (a weekend and a week). The two Distributed clinic treatment groups (Twice a Month and Once a Month) received a similar counseling program over an extended time period (three and six months). The scores of these two groups on all instruments and administration periods were contrasted with an unmatched t-test. Tables 334-349 present both the means and the significant ratios for the various sub-groupings. The same comparisons were also run on the male and female sub-groups.

A. Discomfort Relief Quotient - DRQ

In the comparison of the Concentrated and Distributed groups on the five DRQ categories for the first and only set of this interview derived data (Table 334), significant differences at the .05 level were found in category 4 - Community, and at the .10 level in category 3 - Activity and Goals. No differences at the .01 level were found. These differences are noted in the less personalized areas tapped by the interview categories.

The t-test analysis of the male sub-groups (Table 334) showed statistical significance on one interview category at the .01 level, 4 - Community. Significance was not reached for any additional categories at the .05 or .10 levels. This area showing a difference is one which was also evident between the two total groups in the preceding comparison.

No significant t's were found at the critical .01 or .05 levels between the Concentrated and Distributed group female subjects. Category 3 - Activity and Goals showed a significant trend at the .10 level (Table 334). This category is also significant at the same level in the comparison of the two major experimental sub-groups. In terms of content area, it again represents one of the less personalized in contrast to 1 - Intra-Family and 5 - Parental Relationship areas.

TABLE 334

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED CLINIC GROUP, MOTHERS AND FATHERS ON DRQ SCORES[1,2]

Categories	FULL GROUP			FATHERS			MOTHERS		
	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t
1. Intra-Family	50.75	48.16	N.S.	41.00	44.38	N.S.	57.10	50.91	N.S.
2. Neighborhood	50.76	50.42	N.S.	43.85	41.63	N.S.	55.25	56.82	N.S.
3. Activity-Goals	44.36	55.05	-1.78*	35.54	43.50	N.S.	50.10	63.45	-1.93*
4. Community	73.00	61.53	2.01**	75.77	50.13	3.03***	71.20	69.82	N.S.
5. Parental Relationships	47.24	37.74	N.S.	47.15	24.75	N.S.	47.30	47.18	N.S.

FULL GROUP	FATHERS	MOTHERS
N = 33, 19	N = 13, 8	N = 20, 11
df = 50	df = 19	df = 29
***.01 >2.680	***.01 >2.861	***.01 >2.756
** .05 >2.010	** .05 >2.093	** .05 >2.045
* .10 >1.684	* .10 >1.729	* .10 >1.699

[1] Unmatched t test

[2] Only 1 administration of interview

Since the DRQ scores were obtained from the interview data, only the one pre-counseling comparison exists. Minimal differences between the Concentrated and Distributed clinic populations seems to exist on DRQ scores in the two areas primarily related to community activities and participation and generalized goals and activities of the individuals.

B. Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI)

On Administration I of the PARI significant differences between the Concentrated and Distributed clinic groups (Table 335) were found in two of the 19 categories at the .01 level: 1 - Encouraging Verbalization and 3 - Seclusiveness; 2 - Fostering Dependency at the .05 level; and 16 - Comradeship and Sharing at the .10 level.

TABLE 335

COMPARISON OF THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED CLINIC GROUP ON PARI SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t
1. Encouraging Verbalization	17.67	12.74	3.65***	18.58	17.79	N.S.	18.30	18.11	N.S.
2. Fostering Dependency	10.88	8.63	2.04**	11.12	9.42	2.13**	11.15	10.42	N.S.
3. Seclusiveness	11.39	8.00	3.28***	10.91	10.26	N.S.	10.73	10.37	N.S.
4. Breaking the Will	10.30	9.37	N.S.	9.06	10.63	1.83*	9.79	10.00	N.S.
5. Marital Conflict	15.21	13.95	N.S.	14.97	15.21	N.S.	15.18	14.95	N.S.
6. Strictness	13.76	12.95	N.S.	13.24	14.05	N.S.	13.79	14.00	N.S.
7. Irritability	13.88	13.47	N.S.	13.48	13.47	N.S.	13.61	13.21	N.S.
8. Excluding Outside Influences	12.18	10.11	N.S.	11.12	10.26	N.S.	11.30	10.89	N.S.
9. Deification of Parent	13.48	11.53	N.S.	13.21	12.11	N.S.	13.09	12.68	N.S.
10. Suppression of Aggression	10.39	10.95	N.S.	10.36	9.89	N.S.	10.15	10.58	N.S.

TABLE 335

COMPARISON OF THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED CLINIC GROUP ON PARI SCORES[1]
(CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t
11. Equalitarianism	17.06	15.16	N.S.	18.03	16.47	2.94***	17.24	17.37	N.S.
12. Avoidance of Communication	10.85	10.16	N.S.	9.73	10.00	N.S.	9.97	10.11	N.S.
13. Inconsid'ness	12.09	12.11	N.S.	12.94	12.26	N.S.	13.03	13.63	N.S.
14. Suppression of Sexuality	9.79	9.05	N.S.	7.76	8.58	N.S.	8.45	18.32	N.S.
15. Ascendancy	11.12	11.21	N.S.	10.42	12.32	2.02**	11.18	12.05	N.S.
16. Comradeship and Sharing	18.24	16.37	1.68*	18.58	18.37	N.S.	18.12	18.53	N.S.
17. Expression of Affection	17.85	15.58	N.S.	18.03	17.74	N.S.	18.30	18.32	N.S.
18. Autonomy of Child	18.21	16.37	N.S.	18.36	18.26	N.S.	17.97	18.63	N.S.
19. Achievement	22.79	20.37	N.S.	39.97	23.16	3.84***	22.61	24.15	N.S.

N = 33, 19
df = 50
***.01 > 2.680
** .05 > 2.010
* .10 > 1.684

[1] Unmatched t test

These areas essentially relate to the philosophy of child-rearing practices and the inter-relationship between children and parents. Category 3 - Seclusiveness is the one important area which is concerned more specifically with the behavior of the parent independent of the child or children.

It is not too surprising that two of these categories, 1 - Encouraging Verbalization and 16 - Comradeship and Sharing, also exhibit initial variability on the analysis of variance performed on the experimental group in Question 5. Hence, the variation in these two categories can be partly attributed to differences between the Distributed and Concentrated groups.

On Administration II (Table 335), the t-test between the Concentrated and Distributed populations achieved significance in five categories, only one of which also showed differences on the pre-counseling test battery. Significance at the .01 level was attained in categories 11 - Equalitarianism, and 19 - Achievement, at the .05 level in 2 - Fostering Dependency, and 15 - Ascendancy, and at .10 level in 4 - Breaking the Will.

Category 2 - Fostering Dependency maintains a very similar ratio of variation between the two major groups after the counseling experience as before in contrast to the absence of significance in the other three areas which show initial significant differences. While the specific categories have been altered, the general emphasis areas appear to be dynamically very similar - child-rearing practices relating to discipline, protectiveness, goals, and the interaction of the marital mates.

None of these five areas indicates significant variation over the full experimental group at this same test period on the analysis of variance of Question 5. It would seem that the differences obtained at this point are relatively uniquely distributed between the Concentrated and Distributed group breakdowns.

On the t-test comparison of PARI scores of the Concentrated and Distributed groups on the third administration, no significant differences at any of the three levels were found. The variation which appeared at the pre- and post-counseling periods is no longer existent after the 6-9 months period. This trend is relatively consistent with the finding of an overall diminution of variability within the experimental group (Question 5, Table 195) at this same point.

Differences between the Concentrated and the Distributed clinic groups on PARI scores exist prior to counseling and change immediately following counseling in specific emphasis areas but negligibly in terms of frequency of occurrence. Statistically significant differences between the two on Administration III are not apparent. Counseling treatment and the post-counseling period would seem to have the effect of increasing homogeneity between the groups. This represents a pattern consistent with that noted in the preceding analysis of variance consideration of Question 5 in respect to the overall variation within the experimental group.

In the t-test comparison of the fathers in the Concentrated and Distributed groups on PARI scores (Table 336) generally fewer significant differences were found. On Administration I, statistical significance was found in only one instance, category 15 - Ascendancy at the .05 level. Differences were not present at the .01 or .10 levels.

The significance obtained is essentially related to parental adjustment and also showed significant intra-experimental group variation (Table 178). There is minimal clustering of the variation noted in the experimental group in the male sub-group at this point (Question 5, Tables 175, 179). Apparently that variation does not essentially stem from a difference between the Concentrated and Distributed sub-groups.

TABLE 336

COMPARISON OF THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON PARI SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t
1. Encouraging Verbalization	16.77	11.50	N.S.	17.92	16.25	N.S.	17.69	16.37	N.S.
2. Fostering Dependency	11.08	10.50	N.S.	11.80	10.50	N.S.	11.46	11.50	N.S.
3. Seclusiveness	10.92	9.00	N.S.	11.15	9.25	N.S.	10.15	9.87	N.S.
4. Breaking the Will	10.38	11.50	N.S.	9.46	11.00	N.S.	9.00	10.50	N.S.
5. Marital Conflict	14.85	13.87	N.S.	14.54	15.13	N.S.	15.15	15.13	N.S.
6. Strictness	13.08	12.50	N.S.	12.08	13.75	N.S.	12.85	12.25	N.S.
7. Irritability	13.08	12.00	N.S.	12.46	11.50	N.S.	12.38	10.63	N.S.
8. Excluding Outside Influences	12.00	10.13	N.S.	11.31	10.25	N.S.	11.69	10.63	N.S.
9. Deification of Parent	13.08	11.00	N.S.	12.85	12.63	N.S.	12.92	12.62	N.S.
10. Suppression of Aggression	9.85	9.75	N.S.	9.54	9.50	N.S.	9.31	9.75	N.S.
11. Equalitarianism	16.77	15.38	N.S.	17.62	16.50	N.S.	17.23	17.75	N.S.
12. Avoidance of Communication	10.62	10.13	N.S.	9.23	10.13	N.S.	9.15	10.38	N.S.
13. Inconsid'ness	12.31	12.25	N.S.	12.15	12.63	N.S.	12.23	13.50	N.S.
14. Suppression of Sexuality	10.08	9.38	N.S.	8.31	8.88	N.S.			
15. Ascendancy	9.23	12.38	2.45**	8.77	12.88	3.41***	10.00	12.50	N.S.
16. Comradeship and Sharing	17.85	16.85	N.S.	17.77	17.50	N.S.	17.62	18.00	N.S.
17. Expression of Affection	15.23	13.63	N.S.	15.54	15.37	N.S.	16.00	16.25	N.S.
18. Autonomy of Child	17.15	15.00	N.S.	17.08	17.00	N.S.	17.00	18.00	N.S.

TABLE 336

COMPARISON OF THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON PARI SCORES[1] (CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t
19. Achievement	22.85	20.25	N.S.	22.00	22.25	N.S.	23.31	24.00	N.S.
20. Harsh Punishment	10.08	11.88	N.S.	10.08	11.88	N.S.	9.92	11.88	N.S.
21. Deception	10.08	9.75	N.S.	9.85	8.88	N.S.	9.00	9.38	N.S.
22. Non-punishment	9.46	8.50	N.S.	9.31	7.38	2.68**	9.92	8.25	1.76*
23. Demanding Activity	11.77	12.88	N.S.	12.77	14.00	N.S.	13.31	13.75	N.S.
24. Irresponsibility of Father	10.08	10.88	N.S.	10.00	10.25	N.S.	9.23	10.25	N.S.
25. Avoidance of Expression of Affection	10.46	10.63	N.S.	10.23	9.75	N.S.	10.62	10.36	N.S.
26. Complaint of Ascendancy of Wife	10.38	11.25	N.S.	10.92	10.88	N.S.	10.31	10.63	N.S.
27. Suppression of Affection		11.88	N.S.	11.15	12.75	1.81*	11.31	13.00	N.S.
28. Change Orientation	12.69	11.50	N.S.	12.69	11.75	N.S.	13.15	11.75	N.S.
29. Forcing Independence	12.54	12.13	N.S.	12.54	12.13	N.S.	12.92	12.50	N.S.
30. Past Orientation	12.54	11.88	N.S.	13.00	12.50	N.S.	13.70	12.38	N.S.

N = 13,8
df = 19
*** .01 > 2.861
** .05 > 2.093
* .10 > 1.729

[1] Unmatched *t* test

On Administration II (Table 336), a significant t was again observed in category 15 - Ascendancy at the .01 level and in category 22 - Non-punishment at the .05 level, and 27 - Suppression of Affection at the .10 level.

Counseling seems to have influenced a slight increase in variation between the male members. In relationship to those areas showing post-counseling variation in the overall analysis of variance of the male experimental group (Tables 190-194), only category 15 - Ascendancy is repeated. This would extend and support the suggestion noted at the first testing period that intra-group variation noted in Question 5 can not be essentially attributed to differences between these two major treatment groups in the consideration of the PARI scores for the male sub-population.

For the third testing period (Table 336), a significant trend was found in one category, 22 - Non-punishment at the .10 level. No differences at the .01 or .05 levels were obtained. A stronger indication of difference in this same category was noted for this sub-group on the Test II comparison.

There is a slight increase in the frequency of difference between the male populations of the Concentrated and Distributed groups immediately following counseling. However this pattern reverses itself by the end of the 6-9 months post-counseling period. The area where differences are noted shifts from one primarily related to parental adjustment to one more specifically concerned with child-rearing practices.

Here again, neither the frequency nor the occurrence of statistical differences between the two male segments of the experimental population shows a correlation with the findings of Question 5 (Tables 196-199). This finding suggests that this variation on the PARI on this third test is due to counseling treatment.

When a comparison of the mother sub-groups was made on PARI scores (Table 337), significant differences at the first testing period were found in categories 1 - Encouraging Verbalization, and 3 - Seclusiveness at the .01 level, in 2 - Fostering Dependency and 11 - Equalitarianism at the .05 level; and in 8 - Excluding Outside Influences at the .10 level.

TABLE 337

COMPARISON OF THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON PARI SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t
1. Encouraging Verbalization	18.25	10.73	3.88***	19.00	18.90	2.05**	18.70	19.36	N.S.
2. Fostering Dependency	10.75	7.27	2.13**	11.15	8.63	1.98*	10.95	9.64	N.S.
3. Seclusiveness	11.70	7.27	2.94***	10.75	11.00	N.S.	11.10	10.73	N.S.
4. Breaking the Will	10.25	7.82	N.S.	8.80	10.36	N.S.	10.30	9.64	N.S.
5. Marital Conflict	15.45	14.00	N.S.	15.20	15.27	N.S.	15.20	14.82	N.S.
6. Strictness	14.20	13.27	N.S.	14.00	14.27	N.S.	14.40	13.82	N.S.
7. Irritability	14.40	14.55	N.S.	14.15	14.91	N.S.	14.40	15.09	N.S.
8. Excluding Outside Influences	12.30	10.09	1.83*	11.00	10.27	N.S.	11.05	11.09	N.S.
9. Deification of Parent	13.75	11.91	N.S.	13.45	11.73	N.S.	13.20	12.73	N.S.
10. Suppression of Aggression	10.75	11.82	N.S.	10.70	10.18	N.S.	10.70	11.18	N.S.
11. Equalitarianism	17.25	15.00	2.05**	18.30	16.45	N.S.	17.25	17.09	N.S.
12. Avoidance of Communication	11.00	10.18	N.S.	10.05	9.91	N.S.	10.50	9.91	N.S.
13. Inconsid'ness	11.95	12.00	N.S.	13.45	12.00	N.S.	13.55	13.73	N.S.
14. Suppression of Sexuality	9.60	8.82	N.S.	7.40	8.36	N.S.	8.55	8.09	N.S.

TABLE 337

COMPARISON OF THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON PARI SCORES[1]
(CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t
15. Ascendancy	12.35	10.36	N.S.	11.50	11.91	N.S.	12.20	11.73	N.S.
16. Comradeship and Sharing	18.50	16.45	N.S.	19.10	19.00	N.S.	18.45	18.91	N.S.
17. Expression of Affection	19.55	17.00	N.S.	19.75	19.45	N.S.	19.80	19.82	N.S.
18. Autonomy of Child	18.90	17.36	N.S.	19.30	19.08	N.S.	18.60	19.09	N.S.
19. Achievement	22.75	20.45	N.S.	21.85	22.91	N.S.	22.15	24.27	N.S.
20. Martyrdom	9.10	9.18	N.S.	8.65	8.82	N.S.	9.55	9.18	N.S.
21. Fear of Harming the Baby	12.85	13.00	N.S.	12.85	13.82	N.S.	13.60	13.54	N.S.
22. Rejection of Homemaking Role	12.90	11.55	N.S.	10.40	12.91	1.72*	11.00	12.55	N.S.
23. Approval of Activity	13.80	12.27	N.S.	13.00	12.00	N.S.	13.20	13.36	N.S.
24. Intrusiveness	10.45	10.64	N.S.	10.55	9.27	N.S.	10.55	11.09	N.S.
25. Acceleration of Development	12.45	10.36	N.S.	12.45	10.45	N.S.	12.30	11.00	N.S.
26. Dependency of Mother	12.40	12.36	N.S.	12.00	11.91	N.S.	12.60	12.64	N.S.

N = 20,11
df = 29
*** .01 > 2.756
** .05 > 2.045
* .10 > 1.699

[1] Unmatched *t* test

At this point, the female members of the Concentrated and Distributed clinic groups tend to differ on PARI topics relating both to the philosophy and practices relating to control, sociability of the child and also the seclusiveness of the mother. In two instances, 1 - Encouraging Verbalization and, 11 - Equalitarianism, the comparison coincides with findings on initial intra-group variability in Question 5 (Tables 180, 183).

On Administration II (Table 337) the frequency of significant differences between the female segments of the Concentrated and Distributed groups decreased. No category showed significance at the .01 level; category 1 - Encouraging Verbalization reached it at the .05 level; and categories 2 - Fostering Dependency and 22 - Rejection of the Homemaking Role indicated trends at the .10 level.

Two of the three areas (7 - Encouraging Verbalization and 2 - Fostering Dependency) also reach significance on the pre-counseling comparison. In both instances, significance on this post-counseling analysis is at a less critical level. This decrease in the number of categories showing variation between the two groups coincides with the pattern for the experimental group analysis of variance (Question 5) where significant variation for the female sub-group is found in only one category (Table 194).

On the PARI data for the third testing period, the scores for the female sub-groups showed no significant differences on any of the 19 categories. This decline in the occurrence of differences is consistent with the pattern noted for both the total group comparison (Table 335) and the male sub-group (Table 336). A further indication of the reliability of this finding is the complete lack of variability detected for this subgroup on Test III in Question 5.

On the pre- and first post-test administrations there is a considerably greater frequency of significance between the two groups in the female than the male sub-groups. This may have been partially affected by a somewhat larger sample size for the female sub-group.

On the basis of the consideration of this data it would seem that counseling has a tendency to minimize differences in a population receiving two different time spacing counseling treatments (Concentrated and Distributed) on attitudes relating to patterns of marital adjustment and child-rearing practices. The major shift toward homogeneity seems to have occurred in the 6-9 months period after the counseling experience rather than immediately following termination of counseling.

C. Attitude Scale Toward Mental Retardation (AMR)

On the t-test analysis of the initial AMR category scores of the Concentrated versus the Distributed clinic group (Table 338) significant differences at the .05 level were found in one area, category 33 - Achievement. Differences at .10 level were found for one category, 4 - Normalcy of Development. No differences at the .01 level were derived.

TABLE 338

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED CLINIC GROUP ON AMR SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t
1. Sexuality	9.61	10.21	N.S.	7.97	10.05	3.41***	9.70	10.21	N.S.
2. Genetic Responsibility	4.61	4.74	N.S.	4.85	4.37	N.S.	4.61	4.68	N.S.
3. Appearance	4.58	5.26	N.S.	4.48	4.63	N.S.	4.79	5.37	N.S.
4. Normalcy of Development	36.94	32.89	1.98*	39.48	35.32	N.S.	36.91	35.32	N.S.
5. Dependency	22.76	24.05	N.S.	21.48	25.58	3.41***	22.61	24.74	N.S.
6. Independency	26.70	26.27	N.S.	27.27	25.26	2.59**	26.82	26.58	N.S.
7. Aggression	17.03	16.42	N.S.	16.00	15.32	N.S.	15.88	16.16	N.S.
8. Guilt	19.46	20.32	N.S.	19.97	20.11	N.S.	20.33	20.74	N.S.

TABLE 338

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED CLINIC GROUP ON AMR SCORES[1] (CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t
9. Peer Interaction	26.67	26.74	N.S.	26.21	25.89	N.S.	26.45	26.53	N.S.
10. Concept of Retardation	30.30	31.16	N.S.	28.70	35.68	2.07**	29.18	32.74	1.91*
11. Abasement	25.09	26.63	N.S.	25.00	26.32	N.S.	26.48	27.68	N.S.
12. Comprehension of Self/Others	17.06	16.42	N.S.	15.94	15.95	N.S.	16.45	18.00	N.S.
13. Counteraction	24.64	23.84	N.S.	24.00	23.16	N.S.	23.70	24.47	N.S.
14. Educational Implications and Training	24.73	23.11	N.S.	24.42	23.68	N.S.	23.21	23.79	N.S.
15. Community Provision	16.33	16.84	N.S.	15.85	17.26	2.17**	16.15	17.58	N.S.
16. Emotional-Social Behavior	26.61	28.00	N.S.	24.55	26.05	N.S.	24.61	26.53	N.S.
17. Expression of Affection	18.97	18.26	N.S.	19.36	18.68	N.S.	19.27	19.32	N.S.
18. Suppression of Sex	9.18	9.11	N.S.	7.94	8.58	N.S.	8.45	8.26	N.S.
19. Encouraging Verbalization	16.19	17.84	N.S.	18.15	17.95	N.S.	17.94	18.37	N.S.
20. Excluding Outside Influences	10.82	10.79	N.S.	11.27	10.58	N.S.	10.27	10.68	N.S.
21. Avoid Communication	10.48	9.32	N.S.	9.15	8.79	N.S.	9.30	9.79	N.S.
22. Suppression of Aggression	11.06	10.26	N.S.	9.82	10.42	N.S.	9.85	8.95	N.S.
23. Deification	13.39	12.42	N.S.	14.30	12.16	N.S.	13.58	8.05	2.56**
24. Comradeship and Sharing	17.64	17.95	N.S.	19.09	18.32	N.S.	18.21	18.47	N.S.

TABLE 338

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED CLINIC GROUP ON AMR SCORES[1] (CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. X	Dist. Y	t
25. Strictness	12.70	12.68	N.S.	13.39	12.21	N.S.	13.70	13.47	N.S.
26. Breaking the Will	10.09	9.68	N.S.	9.48	14.84	2.62**	9.52	9.11	N.S.
27. Irritability	13.73	12.68	N.S.	13.73	13.00	N.S.	14.55	15.21	N.S.
28. Autonomy of Child	17.39	17.47	N.S.	18.52	17.79	N.S.	18.21	18.05	N.S.
29. Equalitarianism	16.91	16.58	N.S.	17.48	15.84	3.22***	16.85	16.53	N.S.
30. Approval of Activity	12.36	11.89	N.S.	12.12	12.42	N.S.	13.18	12.63	N.S.
31. Fostering Dependency	11.91	10.64	N.S.	11.85	12.05	N.S.	12.00	11.11	N.S.
32. Acceleration of Development	12.00	11.05	N.S.	12.61	11.53	N.S.	12.09	11.63	N.S.
33. Achievement	22.03	19.63	2.05**	21.30	20.32	N.S.	21.82	22.47	N.S.

N = 33.19
df = 50
*** .01 $>$ 2.680
** .05 $>$ 2.010
* .10 $>$ 1.680

[1] Unmatched _t_ test

Both of these areas show which initial differences are related to goals and the concept of levels of attainment for the retardate. Interestingly, neither of these two categories exhibit significant initial intra-experimental group variation on Question 5 (Table 200-204). Neither do their more generalized counterparts on the PARI show significant differences between these two groups.

On the results of the AMR's administered at the termination of the counseling experience (Table 338), differences between the two groups appeared somewhat more frequently and at more critical levels of significance. Significant differences at the .01 level were observed on three variables, categories 1 - Sexuality, 5 - Dependency, and 29 - Equalitarianism. Four additional categories showed significance at the .05 level; categories 6 - Independency, 10 - Concept of Retardation, 15 - Community Provision and 26 - Breaking the Will. No differences occurred at the .10 level.

Neither of the two categories which are significant on the pre-counseling administration appear as significant at this point. Variability between the two groups seems to have been both increased and altered by the counseling experience. The categories reflecting a significant difference between the two groups are essentially related to three areas: degree of independence and freedom of control to be exercised in handling the retardate, understanding the concept of retardation, and present and future ancillary services available in the care and education of the retardate. The impact of the counseling experience seems to have had a different effect on the different groups. Variation among the experimental population when not contrasted for types of treatment (Question 5)appears in four of the same categories: 1 - Sexuality, 5 - Dependency, 6 - Independency, and 29 - Equalitarianism (Tables 213, 216, 217, and 219).

On the third administration of the AMR (Table 338), minimal differences between the Concentrated and Distributed clinic groups were again observed. Category 23 - Deification was significant at the .05 level, and 10 - Concept of Retardation reached significance at the .10 level. No differences were obtained at the .01 level. It would seem that any major differences seen between the two groups immediately after the counseling experience have been diminished during the 6-9 months time interval preceding the third administration.

Interestingly the differences which occur are not essentially related to aspects of raising the retardate or parental reaction to the condition of retardation. Rather they are concerned more with the intellectual understanding of the situation and the impact on the parent's concept of his role. Relative homogeneity on the other items seems to have been affected. This assumption would be supported by the minimal frequency and levels of significant intra-experimental group variation noted for the AMR post-test II (Tables 224, 225), as well as the complete lack of significant differences between these two groups on the similar, though more generalized, PARI items. These parents may be consistently applying principles of general child-rearing practices to their retarded children whereas the more different areas 10 - Concept of Retardation and 23 - Deification comprise specific problem areas in terms of consistency and self-security.

To what extent counseling influences these patterns cannot be completely understood. It seems apparent that the experience temporarily stimulates thinking (Administration II) and creates a degree of heterogeneity between the groups in terms of expressed attitudes on the AMR Scales.

On the comparison of the AMR scores of the male subjects in the Concentrated and Distributed clinic groups at the three administration periods (Table 339), minimal significant differences are detected. On Administration I significance at the .05 level was reached on category 19 - Encouraging Verbalization (Table 339). No significant differences were found at the .01 or the .10 levels.

TABLE 339

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON AMR SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t
. Sexuality	8.77	10.00	N.S.	7.77	9.50	N.S.	8.85	10.13	N.S.
2. Genetic Responsibility	4.77	4.13	N.S.	4.62	4.25	N.S.	4.46	4.13	N.S.
3. Appearance	4.77	4.88	N.S.	4.38	4.25	N.S.	4.38	5.13	N.S.
4. Normalcy of Development	36.54	34.25	N.S.	38.85	24.38	N.S.	37.00	36.25	N.S.
. Dependency	22.38	21.63	N.S.	21.69	22.63	N.S.	21.77	23.88	N.S.
. Independency	27.08	26.25	N.S.	27.08	26.00	N.S.	27.15	27.63	N.S.
. Aggression	16.31	15.75	N.S.	15.92	13.88	N.S.	15.64	15.75	N.S.
. Guilt	20.15	20.63	N.S.	19.69	19.25	N.S.	20.31	20.00	N.S.
. Peer Interaction	26.92	25.13	N.S.	25.77	24.38	N.S.	25.54	25.50	N.S.
0. Concept of Retardation	30.23	29.00	N.S.	27.46	27.63	N.S.	27.08	30.13	N.S.
1. Abasement	24.15	25.00	N.S.	24.77	23.88	N.S.	26.00	25.13	N.S.
2. Comprehension of Self/Others	15.15	14.88	N.S.	15.69	15.38	N.S.	15.62	18.00	1.80*
3. Counteraction	25.00	24.50	N.S.	24.00	24.88	N.S.	24.23	24.38	N.S.
4. Educational Implications and Training	23.15	21.63	N.S.	34.38	23.50	N.S.	22.92	24.00	N.S.
5. Community Provision	16.62	16.25	N.S.	16.69	16.75	N.S.	15.92	17.63	N.S.
6. Emotional-Social Behavior	26.46	26.00	N.S.	25.08	23.63	N.S.	24.23	24.25	N.S.
7. Expression of Affection	18.46	17.63	N.S.	19.00	18.25	N.S.	18.46	18.88	N.S.
8. Suppression of Sex	9.38	8.00	N.S.	7.85	8.50	N.S.	8.23	8.25	N.S.

TABLE 339

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON AMR SCORES[1]

(CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t
19. Encouraging Verbalization	16.08	18.25	2.26**	17.69	17.25	N.S.	10.46	17.50	N.S.
20. Excluding Outside Influences	10.46	10.38	N.S.	10.69	10.00	N.S.	9.46	10.25	N.S.
21. Avoid Communication	10.23	9.13	N.S.	9.92	9.25	N.S.	9.00	9.38	N.S.
22. Suppression of Aggression	10.38	9.75	N.S.	9.85	8.88	N.S.	9.31	10.75	N.S.
23. Deification	13.85	12.75	N.S.	14.62	12.25	N.S.	14.00	14.50	N.S.
24. Comradeship and Sharing	16.77	18.00	N.S.	18.62	18.30	N.S.	18.00	18.25	N.S.
25. Strictness	11.85	12.63	N.S.	12.54	13.13	N.S.	13.31	14.50	N.S.
26. Breaking the Will	9.46	9.00	N.S.	9.15	9.00	N.S.	9.54	9.63	N.S.
27. Irritability	13.62	11.75	N.S.	12.85	11.25	N.S.	15.69	13.50	N.S.
28. Autonomy of Child	16.69	17.00	N.S.	17.77	17.25	N.S.	17.54	17.75	N.S.
29. Equalitarianism	16.23	16.75	N.S.	16.69	15.88	N.S.	15.85	16.25	N.S.
30. Approval of Activity	11.46	13.00	N.S.	12.31	13.88	N.S.	14.15	13.38	N.S.
31. Fostering Dependency	12.69	10.38	N.S.	12.31	11.88	N.S.	12.23	11.25	N.S.
32. Acceleration of Development	11.85	12.75	N.S.	13.50	12.75	N.S.	12.54	13.50	N.S.
33. Achievement	21.85	20.88	N.S.	22.31	20.50	N.S.	22.38	24.25	N.S.

N = 13.8

df = 19

*** .01 > 2.861

** .05 > 2.093

* .10 > 1.729

[1] Unmatched t test

Variation between the total groups does not reach significance on this category or at any of the three administration periods so it would seem that this difference at this point is unique with the fathers. On Question 5 in the intra-experimental group analysis of variance, this same category shows a tendency toward significance at the .10 level (Table 207). Other areas showing significance on that comparison do not appear on this more specific breakdown (Tables 205 , 206).

On Administration II, the male sub-group showed no areas of significant variation at any level between the Concentrated and Distributed groups (Table 339). Counseling would seem to have had a minimal effect in altering attitudes as neither patterns nor frequency of differences is appreciably altered. This same lack of variability was noted in Question 5 where no significant F values were obtained on the overall analysis of variance.

On the third test administration, the only category showing any significance for the male sub-group of the Concentrated and Distributed clinics was category 12 - Comprehension of Self and Others at the .10 level (Table 339). No differences at the more critical .05 or .01 levels were found.

As for Administration I, this lack of differences reflects less variation between the male components of these two clinic treatment groups than that noted for the same subjects by analysis of variance over the four individual counseling groups (Cazenovia, Minnowbrook, Twice a Month, and Once a Month) (Tables 226, 227, 228). A similar pattern was noted on the comparison of PARI scores (Table 336).

The findings of these t-test comparisons suggest that initially negligible differences between the male sub-populations of the Concentrated and Distributed groups exist on the variables measured by the 33 AMR categories, and that counseling and/or the post-counseling period does not tend to appreciably alter the homogeneity between the two groups.

The initial AMR scores of the female sub-populations of the Concentrated and Distributed groups reached significance at the .05 level on two categories: 30 - Approval of Activity and 33 - Achievement; and at the .10 level in three: 4 - Normalcy of Development, 5 - Dependency and 32 - Acceleration of Development (Table 340). Significance at the .01 level was not reached for any of the 33 categories. Two themes or areas of concern are reflected in these categories - goals, levels and means of achievement, and specific areas of interaction between the retardate and the parent primarily related to dependency and supportive aspects.

TABLE 340

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON AMR SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t
1. Sexuality	10.15	10.36	N.S.	8.10	10.45	2.64**	9.25	10.27	N.S.
2. Genetic Responsibility	4.50	5.18	N.S.	5.00	4.45	N.S.	4.70	5.09	N.S.
3. Appearance	4.45	5.55	N.S.	4.55	4.91	N.S.	5.05	5.55	N.S.
4. Normalcy of Development	37.20	31.91	1.71*	39.90	34.80	2.33**	36.85	34.64	N.S.
5. Dependency	23.00	25.82	1.72*	21.35	27.73	4.09***	23.15	25.73	N.S.
6. Independency	26.45	26.27	N.S.	27.40	24.73	N.S.	26.60	25.82	N.S.
7. Aggression	17.45	16.91	N.S.	16.05	16.36	N.S.	16.15	16.45	N.S.
8. Guilt	19.00	20.09	N.S.	20.15	20.73	N.S.	20.35	21.27	N.S.
9. Peer Interaction	26.50	27.91	N.S.	26.50	27.00	N.S.	27.05	27.27	N.S.
10. Concept of Retardation	30.35	32.73	N.S.	29.50	32.45	N.S.	30.55	34.64	N.S.
11. Abasement	25.70	27.82	N.S.	25.15	28.09	N.S.	26.80	29.55	N.S.
12. Comprehension of Self/Others	18.30	17.55	N.S.	16.10	16.36	N.S.	17.00	18.00	N.S.

TABLE 340

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON AMR SCORES[1] (CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t
13. Counteraction	24.40	23.36	N.S.	24.00	21.91	2.08**	23.35	24.55	N.S.
14. Educational Implications and Training	25.75	24.18	N.S.	24.45	23.82	N.S.	23.40	23.64	N.S.
15. Community Provision	16.15	17.27	N.S.	15.35	17.64	2.68**	16.30	17.55	N.S.
16. Emotional-Social Behavior	26.70	29.45	N.S.	24.20	27.82	1.89*	24.80	28.18	N.S.
17. Expression of Affection	19.30	18.73	N.S.	19.60	19.00	N.S.	19.80	19.64	N.S.
18. Suppression of Sex	9.05	9.91	N.S.	8.00	8.64	N.S.	8.60	8.27	N.S.
19. Encouraging Verbalization	17.45	17.55	N.S.	18.45	18.45	N.S.	26.40	19.91	N.S.
20. Excluding Outside Influences	11.05	11.09	N.S.	11.65	11.00	N.S.	10.80	11.00	N.S.
21. Avoid Communication	10.65	9.45	N.S.	8.65	8.45	N.S.	9.50	1.01	N.S.
22. Suppression of Aggression	11.5	10.64	N.S.	9.80	11.55	N.S.	10.20	11.27	N.S.
23. Deification	13.10	12.18	N.S.	14.10	12.09	1.87*	13.33	12.45	N.S.
24. Comradeship and Sharing	18.20	17.91	N.S.	19.4	18.45	N.S.	18.35	18.64	N.S.
25. Strictness	13.25	12.73	N.S.	13.95	11.55	4.61***	13.95	12.73	N.S.
26. Breaking the Will	10.58	10.18	N.S.	9.70	10.00	N.S.	9.50	8.73	N.S.
27. Irritability	13.80	13.36	N.S.	14.30	14.27	N.S.	13.80	16.45	1.87*
28. Autonomy of Child	17.85	17.82	N.S.	19.00	18.18	N.S.	18.65	18.27	N.S.

TABLE 340

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON AMR SCORES[1] (CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t
29. Equalitarianism	17.35	16.45	N.S.	18.00	15.82	3.46***	17.50	16.73	N.S.
30. Approval of Activity	12.95	11.09	2.52**	12.00	11.36	N.S.	12.55	12.09	N.S.
31. Fostering Dependency	11.4	10.91	N.S.	11.55	12.18	N.S.	11.85	11.91	N.S.
32. Acceleration of Development	12.10	9.82	1.97*	12.25	10.64	N.S.	11.80	10.27	N.S.
33. Achievement	22.15	18.73	2.32**	20.65	20.18	N.S.	21.45	21.18	N.S.

N = 20.11
df = 29
*** .01 > 2.756
** .05 > 2.045
* .10 > 1.699

[1] Unmatched _t_ test

A somewhat similar pattern was noted in the comparison within the entire clinic female sub-group in Question 5 (Tables 208-212). More differentiation between the two groups is seen for these AMR items than is expressed in their more generalized counterparts on the PARI (Table 337).

On Administration II the occurrence of significant t-ratios between the female segments of the Concentrated and Distributed clinic treatment group increased (Table 340). Significant differences at the .01 level were obtained in categories 5 - Dependency, 25 - Strictness and 29 - Equalitarianism; at the .05 level in 1 - Sexuality, 4 - Normalcy of Development and 13 - Counteraction; and at the .10 level in 15 - Community Provision, 16 - Emotional - Social Behavior and 23 - Deification.

Two of the categories which display significance on Administration I scores show increased variation on this post-counseling battery (4 - Normalcy of Development and 5 - Dependency). In the other three categories counseling treatment seems to have significantly diminished the differences. The areas showing significant variation between the two groups encompass a variety of variables: aspects of handling the retardate, restriction in his care, goals, and means of achieving them, an understanding of retardation, and aspects of the personal adjustment of the parent and child. This latter is most strikingly a new area of difference in this question in contrast to the pre-counseling battery. The two different counseling treatments would seem to have created different and increased patterns in expressed attitude structure on the AMR responses.

Appreciably more variation between the two major clinic treatment groups is found in the post-counseling comparison than in the intra-experimental group analysis of variance for the same period in Question 5 (Tables 220-223). All four of the categories which show significant variation in Question 5 are also significant in this comparison. This, plus the occurrence of differences in five additional categories would suggest that the immediate effect of the counseling experience on the female subjects differs appreciably between the Concentrated and Distributed treatment groups. It will be remembered that this finding is not noted for the male sub-population (Table 339), but that a similar pattern is evident for the comparison of the two total groups (Table 338). This pattern of variation on specific references to retardation is also much more predominant than for the generalized parallel topics measured by the PARI (Table 337).

After the post-counseling period of 6-9 months, significant differences between the female segments of the two groups decreased strikingly so that even less variation than initially noted was apparent.

Significance at the .10 level in category 27 - Irritability (Table 340) is the only critical difference noted at any level.

This finding is consistent with the finding of initial variability within the total experimental female group (Table 229) and also with the pattern noted for the comparison of the two complete groups (Table 338). A similar pattern is also found on the female comparison of parallel PARI scores (Table 337) where no significant differences are found.

In general, it appears that the female members of the Concentrated and Distributed clinic groups show minimal variation between each other on AMR scores prior to counseling. Significantly greater differences are evident immediately following the counseling experience but these diminish to a ratio conceivably explainable by chance occurrence after a 6-9 months period of time after counseling during which no direct contacts are maintained. This is very similar to the overall pattern noted for the total group, as well as the initial and final stages for the male sub-group. Except for the male sub-group, counseling seems to have had an immediate effect in creating additional significant variation between the Concentrated and Distributed groups. This pattern is essentially not sustained on the third administration when variation between the two treatment groups on the 33 AMR categories is minimal.

D. Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC): Variable Scores

Initial significant differences between the Concentrated and Distributed clinic groups on GSC variable scores were not found at the .01 level for any of the 35 category variables. Differences at the .05 level were obtained for 3 - Acquiescence, 15 - Integrity and 19 - Nurturance; and at the .10 level for 9 - Benignness, 13 - Dominance and 16 - Intellectualism (Table 341).

TABLE 341

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED CLINIC GROUP ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1]

Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t
1. Abasement	2.15	1.74	N.S.	2.30	1.63	N.S.	2.36	1.68	N.S.
2. Achievement	17.64	18.16	N.S.	20.00	20.95	N.S.	17.91	18.11	N.S.
3. Acquiescence	9.21	12.16	2.42**	11.06	11.84	N.S.	13.09	13.37	N.S.
4. Acquisition	1.76	2.42	N.S.	1.55	1.74	N.S.	2.30	1.74	N.S.
5. Affiliation	13.45	14.79	N.S.	15.03	13.21	N.S.	13.91	14.32	N.S.
6. Aggression	3.64	3.84	N.S.	3.27	3.58	N.S.	3.64	4.16	N.S.
7. Autonomy	1.45	1.21	N.S.	1.39	1.74	N.S.	1.94	1.63	N.S.
8. Avoidance	1.48	1.11	N.S.	1.33	1.89	N.S.	1.30	1.68	N.S.
9. Benignness	6.76	4.63	1.81*	5.36	5.11	N.S.	6.67	5.16	N.S.
10. Counteraction	1.09	0.95	N.S.	1.09	1.16	N.S.	1.12	1.42	N.S.
11. Deference	2.48	1.89	N.S.	2.79	2.84	N.S.	2.88	2.58	N.S.
12. Description	4.03	4.05	N.S.	4.82	4.68	N.S.	5.55	5.16	N.S.
13. Dominance	3.45	5.05	1.92*	4.09	3.89	N.S.	4.61	3.26	1.80*
14. Identification	2.15	1.58	N.S.	2.61	3.16	N.S.	2.42	2.68	N.S.
15. Integrity	3.18	1.95	2.33**	2.21	1.89	N.S.	2.76	1.79	2.03**
16. Intellectualism	5.36	7.26	1.80*	5.85	7.58	1.72*	5.33	7.16	2.02**
17. Irritability	3.33	3.89	N.S.	2.91	3.95	2.00*	2.70	4.32	3.05***
18. Narcissism	0.48	0.26	N.S.	0.58	0.58	N.S.	0.76	0.74	N.S.
19. Nurturance	1.30	9.05	2.40**	11.94	9.21	2.28**	11.76	9.63	N.S.
20. Omission	6.88	8.37	N.S.	4.70	3.16	N.S.	2.18	2.37	N.S.
21. Optimism	1.55	1.37	N.S.	1.42	1.74	N.S.	1.00	1.58	1.95*
22. Order	1.67	2.26	N.S.	1.48	2.05	N.S.	2.06	2.05	N.S.
23. Pessimism	0.30	0.26	N.S.	0.15	0.16	N.S.	0.33	0.32	N.S.
24. Phobia	2.12	2.42	N.S.	2.67	2.21	N.S.	2.00	2.21	N.S.
25. Play	2.91	2.79	N.S.	2.73	3.79	N.S.	2.64	2.42	N.S.

TABLE 341

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED CLINIC GROUP ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1]
(CONT)

Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t
26. Refusal	2.73	2.58	N.S.	3.00	2.37	N.S.	3.30	3.68	N.S.
27. Rejection	7.88	8.74	N.S.	9.15	10.00	N.S.	8.27	8.47	N.S.
28. Seclusion	0.52	0.47	N.S.	0.52	0.74	N.S.	0.55	0.47	N.S.
29. Sentience	11.45	10.53	N.S.	10.21	10.58	N.S.	10.52	9.32	N.S.
30. Sex	0.21	0.11	N.S.	0.58	0.21	N.S.	0.33	0.26	N.S.
31. Submissiveness	0.70	0.53	N.S.	0.42	0.00	2.62**	0.33	0.37	N.S.
32. Succorance	3.42	2.95	N.S.	3.12	3.00	N.S.	4.03	3.32	N.S.
33. Supernaturalism	2.91	3.05	N.S.	2.03	2.63	N.S.	2.48	1.89	N.S.
34. Understanding	4.58	4.53	N.S.	4.73	4.73	N.S.	4.39	4.05	N.S.
35. Unhappiness	2.00	2.00	N.S.	2.06	2.37	N.S.	2.45	2.16	N.S.

N = 33.19
df = 50
*** .01 > 2.680
** .05 > 2.010
* .10 > 1.684

[1] Unmatched t test

Variables showing differences between the two groups seem to be primarily related to aspects of both directions of aggression, dominance and protective behaviors, and the intellectual approach to situations. This comparison of the two major clinic treatment groups shows greater variation than the initial analysis of variance in Question 5 for the entire experimental population. This suggests that greater differences on initial GSC variable scores exist when these two treatment groups are arranged in contra-distinction to each other. Relatively greater initial differences exist between these two groups on the GSC variables than on the categories of the other instruments considered thus far.

On the post-counseling administration, differences at the .01 level were again non-existent. Differences reaching significance at the .05 level were obtained in two instances; variables 19 - Nurturance and 31 - Submissiveness. Trends at the .10 level were present in 16 - Intellectualism and 17 - Irritability.

This represents a slight decrease in variation between the two groups. Two of the six categories that show significant differences on the pre-test maintain divergence at the same critical level: 16 - Intellectualism and 19 - Nurturance. Significance still remains in the dominance - protection cluster, the intellectual area and the more personally oriented variable; 17 - Irritability. The different counseling treatments seem to have had the immediate effect of both minimizing differences between the two groups in some areas and creating new variation in some others. A similar general pattern was seen in the Question 5 analysis of variance at this point of the entire experimental group population. The generalized trend toward lessened variation between the two clinic treatment groups immediately following counseling is the opposite of that noted for both PARI and AMR score comparisons.

On the comparison of the third set of GSC scores the frequency of significant differences was not appreciably diminished or increased in contrast to Administrations I and II. Significance reaching the .01 level was obtained for category variable 17 - Irritability, at the .05 level for variables 15 - Integrity and 16 - Intellectualism, and at the .10 level for 13 - Dominance and 21 - Optimism.

One variable, 16 - Intellectualism, showed significant variation between the two major clinic treatment groups on all three administrations. Counseling or the post-counseling period does not seem to have appreciably affected the heterogeneity existing between the two groups on this category.

Differences initially obtained for 13 - Dominance and 15 - Integrity are not significant in Administration II but again exhibit heterogeneity on the last administration. Conceivably any alteration in attitude or need patterns brought about in one or both of the sub-groups by counseling may be temporary. On the other hand, 17 - Irritability first shows heterogeneity between the two groups following counseling and maintains that pattern on the third test. In only one instance, 21 - Optimism, does variability between the two treatment groups originate at the third test period. Here the opportunity afforded during the post-counseling period for the consolidation of ideas and information may be a contributory factor. The disappearance of statistical significance in 19 - Nurturance and 31 - Submissiveness should also be noted in this context.

For the male (Table 342), initial significant differences were obtained at the .05 level for one variable: 11 - Deference; and at the .10 level for two others: 19 - Nurturance and 27 - Rejection. No t's reached significance at the .01 level.

TABLE 342

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1]

Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t
1. Abasement	2.23	1.50	N.S.	2.00	1.87	N.S.	2.46	1.75	N.S.
2. Achievement	17.62	18.38	N.S.	19.00	22.5	N.S.	18.85	19.00	N.S.
3. Acquiescence	10.38	11.38	N.S.	11.69	13.13	N.S.	14.92	13.25	N.S.
4. Acquisition	2.31	3.00	N.S.	2.62	1.63	N.S.	3.38	1.5	1.83*
5. Affiliation	12.08	14.25	N.S.	14.77	10.63	1.92*	13.46	13.75	N.S.
6. Aggression	3.23	2.75	N.S.	3.00	3.13	N.S.	3.15	3.75	N.S.
7. Autonomy	1.38	1.25	N.S.	1.77	1.25	N.S.	1.69	1.13	N.S.
8. Avoidance	2.23	1.38	N.S.	2.08	2.25	N.S.	2.00	1.38	N.S.
9. Benignness	5.31	6.13	N.S.	5.54	6.88	N.S.	5.31	8.00	N.S.

TABLE 342

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1] (CONT)

riables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t
Counteraction	1.31	1.50	N.S.	1.31	1.63	N.S.	1.46	2.13	1.74*
Deference	2.69	1.25	2.73**	3.54	2.63	N.S.	2.92	2.75	N.S.
Description	3.85	5.75	N.S.	4.54	5.63	N.S.	5.31	4.38	N.S.
Dominance	4.85	4.13	N.S.	4.00	3.50	N.S.	5.69	2.75	2.50**
Identification	2.00	2.25	N.S.	2.15	4.13	2.14**	2.15	2.88	N.S.
Integrity	3.62	2.25	N.S.	3.08	1.25	2.33**	3.00	1.63	N.S.
Intellectualism	6.85	6.50	N.S.	7.46	6.88	N.S.	6.38	7.75	N.S.
Irritability	4.00	3.38	N.S.	2.77	4.38	1.84*	2.77	3.25	N.S.
Narcissism	0.62	0.13	N.S.	0.46	0.25	N.S.	1.08	0.75	N.S.
Nurturance	13.85	9.38	1.77*	12.46	7.25	2.79**	12.54	10.00	N.S.
Omission	4.08	11.13	N.S.	1.92	3.38	N.S.	2.23	2.63	N.S.
Optimism	1.62	1.63	N.S.	1.31	2.25	1.93*	0.92	2.63	3.21***
Order	1.77	2.50	N.S.	1.38	1.38	N.S.	2.38	1.00	1.89*
Pessimism	0.92	0.75	N.S.	0.38	0.00	N.S.	0.31	0.00	N.S.
Phobia	2.54	1.88	N.S.	3.23	1.88	1.99*	1.62	1.88	N.S.
Play	3.38	2.88	N.S.	3.54	3.38	N.S.	3.77	2.13	N.S.
Refusal	2.85	2.13	N.S.	3.23	3.38	N.S.	3.23	5.63	N.S.
Rejection	6.62	9.13	1.90*	8.15	10.88	N.S.	7.54	9.00	N.S.
Seclusion	0.31	0.13	N.S.	0.62	0.50	N.S.	0.46	0.38	N.S.
Sentience	9.92	11.25	N.S.	9.54	10.50	N.S.	8.54	12.25	1.80*
Sex	0.23	0.25	N.S.	0.85	0.25	N.S.	0.46	0.25	N.S.
Submissiveness	0.69	0.50	N.S.	0.38	0.00	N.S.	0.08	0.00	N.S.

TABLE 342

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED
CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1]
(CONT)

Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t
32. Succorance	3.77	2.63	N.S.	3.54	3.50	N.S.	3.54	2.50	N.S.
33. Supernaturalism	3.15	1.25	N.S.	2.31	1.75	N.S.	2.23	1.63	N.S.
34. Understanding	5.31	3.50	N.S.	3.15	2.88	N.S.	3.77	3.88	N.S.
35. Unhappiness	1.23	1.63	N.S.	1.23	2.13	N.S.	2.15	2.25	N.S.

N = 13.8
df = 19
*** .01 > 2.861
** .05 > 2.093
* .10 > 1.729

[1] Unmatched t test

The significant variables are primarily related to the relationship of the respondent to other people and objects in his environment. A somewhat similar, though less frequent, dynamic pattern is noted for this sub-group on the overall analysis of the experimental group (Question 5, Tables 234 and 235).

On the comparison of the Test II scores, significant variation between the two male sub-groups increased in the frequency of occurrence. No significant t's were derived at the .01 level. Differences at the .05 level were noted for variables 14 - Identification, 15 - Integrity and 19 - Nurturance, and at the .10 level for 5 - Affiliation, 17 - Irritability, 21 - Optimism, and 24 - Phobia.

Only in 19 - Nurturance is the initial variation again noted. The majority of the increased differences between the two treatment groups falls into areas relevant to interpersonal relationships, values, fears and irritating circumstances, and optimism toward the future.

These significant variables are different in each instance from the four on which significant variation within the total experimental group is found in the consideration of Question 5 (Tables 248-251). It would seem that counseling effects more increase in heterogeneity between these two major counseling treatment groups than was detected by the more gross analysis for the four component groups. It lends support to the assumption that this breakdown exhibits greater heterogeneity as a result of the differentiated counseling treatment.

For Administration III (Table 342), a minor decrease in the frequency of variation between the fathers of the two major clinic treatment groups existed. Significance at the .01 level was reached for variable 21 - Optimism, at the .05 level for 13 - Dominance, and at the .10 level for 4 - Acquisition, 10 - Counteraction, 22 - Order and 29 - Sentience.

With the exception of 21 - Optimism, significance between the two male sub-groups occurs in variables not previously indicating heterogeneity. So that ,while the general frequency of differences is quite similar to that noted immediately following counseling a greater amount of change is reflected in that relative homogeneity is achieved in the bulk of the previously noted variables (Test I and II). At the same time, this homogeneity is significantly decreased in other variables. The areas signifying heterogeneity on Test III seem to be more closely related to aspects of personality adjustment and material concern than the patterns noted for earlier test periods. A similar incidence and pattern is noted in Question 5 (Tables 263-270). Perhaps the combination of the counseling and the post-counseling period affords an opportunity for the individuals to resolve conflicts in certain specific areas but also to be more free and individualistic in expressing personal feelings.

In contrast to the pattern noted on the comparison over the three administrations for the full populations of the Concentrated and Distributed groups (Table 341) there is a slightly greater incidence of difference between the male segments on the post-counseling and the third administration but a lesser indication of difference for the pre-counseling test. These data would suggest that barring statistical artifacts the male sub-groups are influenced toward more heterogeneity by the counseling treatment.

For the comparison between the Concentrated and Distributed female subjects (Table 343), significance on the pre-test was obtained at the .01 level for three category variables: 9 - Benignness, 13 - Dominance and 16 - Intellectualism; at the .05 level for four: 3 - Acquiescence, 14 - Identification 17 - Irritability and 33 - Supernaturalism; and trends at the .10 level for three: 19 - Nurturance, 24 - Phobia and 29 - Sentience.

TABLE 343

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED
CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1]

Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t
1. Abasement	2.10	1.91	N.S.	2.50	1.45	N.S.	2.30	1.64	N.S.
2. Achievement	17.65	18.00	N.S.	20.65	19.82	N.S.	17.30	17.36	N.S.
3. Acquiescence	8.45	12.73	2.40**	10.65	10.91	N.S.	11.90	13.45	N.S.
4. Acquisition	1.40	2.00	N.S.	0.85	1.82	1.74*	1.60	1.73	N.S.
5. Affiliation	14.35	14.27	N.S.	15.20	15.09	N.S.	14.20	14.73	N.S.
6. Aggression	3.90	4.64	N.S.	3.45	3.91	N.S.	3.95	4.45	N.S.
7. Autonomy	1.50	1.18	N.S.	1.15	1.82	N.S.	2.10	2.00	N.S.
8. Avoidance	1.00	0.91	N.S.	0.85	1.64	1.90*	0.85	1.91	1.91*
9. Benignness	7.70	3.55	2.80***	5.25	3.82	N.S.	7.55	4.00	2.14**
10. Counteraction	0.95	0.55	N.S.	0.95	0.82	N.S.	0.90	0.91	N.S.
11. Deference	2.35	2.36	N.S.	2.30	3.00	N.S.	2.85	2.45	N.S.
12. Description	4.15	2.82	N.S.	4.00	4.00	N.S.	5.70	5.73	N.S.
13. Dominance	2.55	5.73	3.22***	4.15	4.18	N.S.	3.90	3.64	N.S.
14. Identification	2.25	1.09	2.08**	2.90	2.45	N.S.	2.60	2.55	N.S.
15. Integrity	2.85	1.73	N.S.	1.65	2.36	N.S.	2.60	1.91	N.S.
16. Intellectualism	4.40	7.82	2.76***	4.80	8.09	3.04***	4.65	6.73	1.99*

TABLE 343

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1]
(CONT)

Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t
17. Irritability	2.90	4.27	2.64**	3.00	3.64	N.S.	2.65	5.09	3.49***
18. Narcissism	0.40	0.36	N.S.	0.65	0.82	N.S.	0.85	1.27	N.S.
19. Nurturance	12.50	8.82	1.83*	11.60	10.64	N.S.	11.25	9.36	N.S.
20. Omission	8.70	6.36	N.S.	6.50	3.00	N.S.	2.15	2.18	N.S.
21. Optimism	1.50	1.18	N.S.	2.00	1.36	N.S.	1.00	0.82	N.S.
22. Order	1.60	2.09	N.S.	1.55	2.55	N.S.	1.85	2.82	N.S.
23. Pessimism	0.20	0.43	N.S.	0.00	0.27	N.S.	0.35	0.54	N.S.
24. Phobia	1.85	2.82	1.79*	2.30	2.45	N.S.	2.25	2.45	N.S.
25. Play	2.60	2.73	N.S.	2.20	4.09	2.16**	1.90	2.64	N.S.
26. Refusal	2.65	2.00	N.S.	2.85	1.64	N.S.	3.35	2.27	N.S.
27. Rejection	8.70	8.45	N.S.	9.80	9.36	N.S.	8.75	8.09	N.S.
28. Seclusion	0.65	0.73	N.S.	0.45	0.91	N.S.	0.60	0.55	N.S.
29. Sentience	12.45	10.00	1.74*	10.65	9.91	N.S.	11.80	7.18	2.50**
30. Sex	0.20	0.00	N.S.	0.40	0.18	N.S.	0.25	0.27	N.S.
31. Submissiveness	0.70	0.55	N.S.	0.45	0.00	2.46**	0.50	0.64	N.S.
32. Succorance	3.20	3.18	N.S.	2.85	2.64	N.S.	4.35	3.91	N.S.
33. Supernaturalism	2.75	4.36	2.15**	1.85	3.27	2.37**	2.65	3.00	N.S.
34. Understanding	4.10	5.27	N.S.	5.75	5.45	N.S.	4.80	4.18	N.S.
35. Unhappiness	2.50	2.27	N.S.	2.60	2.55	N.S.	2.65	2.09	N.S.

N = 20.11
df = 29
*** .01 > 2.756
** .05 > 2.045
* .10 > 1.699

[1] Unmatched *t* test

This occurrence represents a greater frequency of initial difference than that obtained between the two total clinic groups or the male sub-groups. This finding is also in contrast to the isolation of only four areas of significant initial variation within the overall female experimental population in Question 5 (Tables 236-239). These results suggest that sharper differences between the two major groups have contributed to the variability of the findings.

The variables indicating differences between the two groups seem primarily related to aspects of a dominance-protection-assistance cycle as well as to fear, intellectualism and irritability. This content pattern is esentially similar to that noted for the entire group at the first test administration.

For the second test administration, the frequency of differences between the two groups is somewhat less than that prior to counseling. Significance at the .01 level was reached for one variable: 16 - Intellectualism; at the .05 level for 25 - Play, 31 - Submissiveness and 33 - Supernaturalism; and at the .10 level for 4 - Acquisition and 8 - Avoidance (Table 343).

In two of these instances, 16 - Intellectualism and 33 - Supernaturalism, heterogeneity initially found still exists at significant levels. The other four variables mentioned represent new variation. Eight of the variables which were significant on Test I no longer show differences. It would seem that here again, the counseling experience decreases differences in some aspects while increasing them in others. There seems to be a tendency for significance to center more on the material, intellectual and self-gratification aspects rather than the more interactive aspects initially noted. The decrease in the number of significantly variant categories is similarly noted for the comparison of the overall female experimental group on the post-counseling battery (Question 5, Tables 252, 253).

On the third test administration, significance at the .01 level was obtained in one category variable: 17 - Irritability; at the .05 level in 9 - Benignness and 29 - Sentience; and at the .10 level in 8 - Avoidance and 16 - Intellectualism.

For the most part, significance of GSC variables between the two female sub-groups noted on the third test administration represents either a continuation of, or more frequently, a return to an area of variability noted either prior to and/or immediately following counseling. Obviously, the counseling treatment tends to create temporary alteration of attitudes in some instances, but after an interval of time following the counseling experience initial patterns of variation are resumed between the mother sub-populations of the Concentrated and Distributed clinic groups. In addition, the decrease in the frequencies of heterogeneity is also noted. It would seem that change toward homogeneity is irreversible in some variables. The areas showing significant final variation represent a variety of dynamics: basic personality adjustment patterns, intellectual approaches, interaction and self- gratification themes. This represents a more diversified pattern than that noted for the total group or the male sub-group comparisons. However, the general pattern for a diminishment of the frequency of the occurrence of variation in the two post-counseling test periods is consistent with that noted for the full population comparisons.

The semi-restricted structure of the GSC scales allows for a greater range of personalized responses to the items. The related assumption that greater variation between individuals, and thus groups, would exist on GSC scores is borne out by the generally greater frequency of significant variation appearing between the Concentrated and Distributed groups in this comparison. Similarly, a greater occurrence of intra-experimental group variation on GSC variables was obtained in Question 5 (Tables 230-276). The father sub-group shows the only appreciable deviation from this general pattern in the comparison of the Concentrated and

Distributed groups. Their lower frequency of variation shown on the pretest may reflect a generalized cultural pattern toward more objectivity on the part of males. If this assumption is tenable, counseling would seem to have influenced a relaxation of this pattern.

The AMR and PARI generally show greatest differentiation between the Concentrated and Distributed groups immediately following counseling with minimal differences occurring at both the Test I and Test III periods. The GSC comparison presents a somewhat different pattern. In both the total groups and the female sub-groups, the greatest frequency of variation occurs at the initial test period and a consistent ratio is maintained over the Test II and III periods. The male sub-group closely approximates the pattern noted on PARI and AMR scores with the exception that a negligible decrease from Test II to Test III is indicated.

A comparatively greater amount of significance on GSC variable comparison reached the more critical .01 level than that noted for the other scores already reported (DRQ, PARI, and AMR).

D. Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC): Direction Scores

No significant differences on GSC direction scores were obtained on the t-test comparison of the Concentrated and the Distributed clinic groups for any of the three test periods (Table 344).

TABLE 344

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED CLINIC GROUP ON GSC . DIRECTION SCORES[1]

Category	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t
1. Positive	84.84	84.21	N.S.	86.72	84.63	N.S.	87.39	84.31	N.S.
2. Negative	52.03	52.79	N.S.	52.97	56.21	N.S.	54.21	56.89	N.S.
3. Neutral	12.27	12.00	N.S.	9.33	8.16	N.S.	7.64	7.79	N.S.

N = 33.19 *** .01 > 2.680 * .10 > 1.684
df = 50 ** .05 > 2.010 [1]Unmatched t test

No statistically significant differences were found on the GSC direction scores of the male subjects of the Concentrated and the Distributed counseling treatment groups for any of the three administrations (Table 345).

TABLE 345

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON GSC. DIRECTION SCORES[1]

Category	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t
1. Positive	87.23	85.62	N.S.	88.62	87.75	N.S.	90.53	87.75	N.S.
2. Negative	53.30	47.50	N.S.	53.77	52.88	N.S.	52.00	54.50	N.S.
3. Neutral	8.46	15.88	N.S.	6.69	8.83	N.S.	7.23	7.25	N.S.

N = 13.8
df = 19
*** .01 > 2.861
** .05 > 2.093
* .10 > 1.729

[1] Unmatched _t_ test

On the comparison of the GSC direction scores for the female subpopulation. no initial differences were noted. On the post-counseling administration significant variation was found at the .05 level for the 2 - Negative direction designation only. This significant variation does not maintain itself during the post-counseling period as no significant differences are again observed for Administration III (Table 346).

TABLE 346

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON GSC DIRECTION SCORES[1]

Category	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t
1. Positive	83.30	83.81	N.S.	85.50	82.36	N.S.	85.35	82.18	N.S.
2. Negative	51.20	56.64	N.S.	52.45	58.64	2.08**	55.65	58.64	N.S.
3. Neutral	14.75	9.18	N.S.	11.05	8.00	N.S.	7.90	8.18	N.S.

N = 20.11
df = 29
*** .01 > 2.756
** .05 > 2.045
* .10 > 1.699

[1] Unmatched t test

E. Stern Activities Index (SAI)

On the pre-counseling administration, significant differences on SAI need variables between the Concentrated and the Distributed clinic groups (Table 347) existed at the .01 level for 20 - Nurturance, 23 - Aggression and 24 - Dominance, at the .05 level for 11 - Harmavoidance, 19 - Affiliation and 34 - Rejection, and at the .10 level for 8 - Abasement and 35 - Autonomy.

TABLE 347

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED CLINIC GROUP ON SAI SCORES[1]

Need Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t
1. Sentience	3.15	3.53	N.S.	3.45	2.63	N.S.	3.52	2.95	N.S.
2. Sex	3.15	3.58	N.S.	3.67	3.21	N.S.	3.42	2.21	N.S.
3. Change	6.42	6.00	N.S.	6.85	6.39	N.S.	6.52	6.37	N.S.
4. Play	4.33	5.05	N.S.	4.70	4.34	N.S.	5.03	4.68	N.S.

TABLE 347

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED CLINIC GROUP ON SAI SCORES[1] (CONT)

Need Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t	Conc. $\bar{X}$	Dist. $\bar{Y}$	t
5. Energy	5.45	6.05	N.S.	5.70	5.42	N.S.	5.67	5.79	N.S.
6. Pragmatism	8.79	6.89	N.S.	7.82	7.53	N.S.	7.09	7.42	N.S.
7. Adaptiveness	3.85	3.21	N.S.	3.64	2.53	2.11**	3.21	3.26	N.S.
8. Abasement	3.82	3.21	1.77*	3.79	2.89	2.28**	3.73	3.68	N.S.
9. Deference	6.91	6.68	N.S.	7.33	6.95	N.S.	6.94	6.47	N.S.
10. Order	5.97	5.53	N.S.	5.88	5.84	N.S.	5.94	5.58	N.S.
11. Harmavoidance	8.27	6.89	2.72**	7.73	6.84	N.S.	7.61	6.74	N.S.
12. Understanding	5.27	5.37	N.S.	5.55	5.68	N.S.	5.12	5.74	N.S.
13. Counteraction	5.94	5.58	N.S.	5.82	5.11	N.S.	5.94	5.68	N.S.
14. Achievement	4.64	4.95	N.S.	5.33	4.79	N.S.	5.24	4.79	N.S.
15. Reflectiveness	5.67	5.79	N.S.	5.82	5.84	N.S.	5.73	5.68	N.S.
16. Humanism	5.76	5.11	N.S.	5.39	4.53	N.S.	4.97	4.37	N.S.
17. Scientism	3.85	4.84	N.S.	3.39	4.37	N.S.	3.67	4.11	N.S.
18. Objectivity	6.70	7.47	N.S.	6.48	7.32	N.S.	6.36	7.21	N.S.
19. Affiliation	7.42	6.00	2.39**	7.39	5.37	3.67***	7.12	5.47	2.67**
[illegible]	7.42	6.00	2.39**	7.39	5.37	3.67***	7.12	5.47	2.67**
20. Nurturance	8.52	7.47	3.92***	8.42	7.05	2.93***	9.24	7.05	3.84***
21. Succorance	7.42	6.84	N.S.	7.82	6.63	2.33**	7.64	6.32	2.22**
22. Conjunctivity	6.33	5.79	N.S.	6.27	5.68	N.S.	5.70	5.42	N.S.
23. Aggression	6.06	2.74	2.68***	2.27	2.79	N.S.	2.12	2.32	N.S.
24. Dominance	4.36	3.11	5.76***	3.73	3.74	N.S.	4.12	3.11	1.84*
25. Narcissism	5.21	5.63	N.S.	4.55	5.74	N.S.	5.52	5.58	N.S.
26. Fantasied Achievement	5.64	5.37	N.S.	5.55	5.47	N.S.	5.06	5.95	N.S.
27. Ego Achievement	4.18	4.05	N.S.	4.24	4.32	N.S.	4.58	4.37	N.S.
28. Exhibitionism	3.45	3.21	N.S.	3.55	3.47	N.S.	4.24	3.47	N.S.
29. Impulsion	4.36	4.37	N.S.	4.39	5.21	N.S.	4.76	4.37	N.S.

TABLE 347

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED CLINIC GROUP ON SAI SCORES[1] (CONT)

Need Variables	ADMINISTRATION I Conc. $\bar{X}$	ADMINISTRATION I Dist. $\bar{Y}$	ADMINISTRATION I t	ADMINISTRATION II Conc. $\bar{X}$	ADMINISTRATION II Dist. $\bar{Y}$	ADMINISTRATION II t	ADMINISTRATION III Conc. $\bar{X}$	ADMINISTRATION III Dist. $\bar{Y}$	ADMINISTRATION III t
30. Emotionality	2.76	3.47	N.S.	3.33	3.16	N.S.	3.79	3.53	N.S.
31. Prudery	6.79	6.42	N.S.	6.33	6.79	N.S.	6.52	7.79	N.S.
32. Sameness	3.58	3.95	N.S.	3.15	3.63	N.S.	3.48	3.63	N.S.
33. Passivity	4.39	4.47	N.S.	4.24	4.58	N.S.	4.33	4.21	N.S.
34. Rejection	2.18	3.26	2.57**	1.94	3.79	4.70***	2.52	3.74	2.47**
35. Autonomy	2.61	3.47	1.88*	2.18	3.37	2.33**	2.36	3.68	2.21**
36. Disjunctivity	3.67	4.21	N.S.	3.73	4.32	N.S.	4.30	4.58	N.S.
37. Blameavoidance	8.09	7.42	N.S.	7.73	7.21	N.S.	7.88	7.68	N.S.
38. Infavoidance	5.27	5.58	N.S.	5.27	5.74	N.S.	4.82	5.47	N.S.
39. Deliberation	5.58	5.63	N.S.	5.61	5.11	N.S.	5.24	5.63	N.S.
40. Placidity	7.24	6.53	N.S.	5.39	6.84	1.79*	6.70	6.68	N.S.

N = 33.19
df = 50
*** $.01 > 2.680$
** $.05 > 2.010$
* $.10 > 1.684$

[1] Unmatched *t* test

[1] Unmatched *t* test

The cluster of these significant variables is quite similar to the pattern for the GSC variables (Table 341). There seems to be a preponderance of heterogeneity in areas related to the interaction of the individual with others. A very similar dynamic pattern is noted for the initial analysis of variance within the full experimental group in Question 5 (Tables 278-282).

On the second administration, the number of significant differences remained the same. In over half the cases the specific variable reflecting significant variation also remained unchanged. Differences at the .01 level were obtained in variable 19 - Affiliation, 20 - Nurturance and 34 - Rejection, at the .05 level in 7 - Adaptiveness, 8 - Abasement, 21 - Succorance and 35 - Autonomy, and at the .10 level in 40 - Placidity (Table 347).

The appearance of new variation and the reduction of initial differences between the two groups seems to have occurred primarily in the area of interaction patterns to other individuals and groups. While the specific categories vary somewhat, this same general dynamic pattern is reflected in the overall analysis of variance for the experimental group in Question 5 (Tables 295-301). Different counseling treatments would then seem to have little immediate effect upon the alteration of the patterns of expressed need variables as measured by the SAI.

For the comparison of Test III scores, significant differences between the Concentrated and Distributed groups were found for six of the 40 SAI need variables: 20 - Nurturance at the .01 level; 19 - Affiliation, 21 - Succorance, 34 - Rejection and 35 - Autonomy at the .05 level; and 24 - Dominance at the .10 level.

Here again, variation between the two groups after the post-counseling period still exists in essentially the same areas and the same categories as for Administration I and/or II. A consistent pattern prevails for the overall counseling population in Question 5 (Tables 317-320). The spacing of counseling treatments seems to have had no appreciable effect in influencing either the frequency or the pattern of variation between the Concentrated and Distributed clinic groups on SAI variable scores.

On the t - test comparison of the father subjects in the Concentrated and Distributed clinic groups (Table 348) on the initial set of SAI scores, significant differences between the two groups were obtained in three of the 40 need variables: 1 - Harmavoidance at the .01 level; and 4 - Play and 35 - Autonomy at the .10 level. No significant differences at the .05 level of confidence were noted.

TABLE 348

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED
CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON SAI SCORES[1]

Need Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t
1. Sentience	2.46	3.50	N.S.	2.62	3.25	N.S.	3.08	2.88	N.S.
2. Sex	2.92	4.38	N.S.	3.46	3.38	N.S.	3.54	2.88	N.S.
3. Change	6.54	5.63	N.S.	6.38	7.00	N.S.	6.54	6.88	N.S.
4. Play	3.69	5.13	2.03*	3.92	4.50	N.S.	4.62	3.75	N.S.
5. Energy	5.92	7.13	N.S.	6.15	6.13	N.S.	6.00	6.50	N.S.
6. Pragmatism	8.15	7.38	N.S.	8.15	7.63	N.S.	6.92	7.75	N.S.
7. Adaptiveness	3.85	2.88	N.S.	4.23	2.88	N.S.	3.23	3.75	N.S.
8. Abasement	3.46	3.13	N.S.	3.92	2.88	N.S.	4.15	3.50	N.S.
9. Deference	6.62	6.50	N.S.	7.23	6.50	N.S.	6.54	6.38	N.S.
10. Order	5.46	4.00	N.S.	5.54	4.38	N.S.	5.08	4.38	N.S.
11. Harmavoidance	8.15	5.00	7.74***	7.62	4.88	3.28***	6.46	3.88	2.87***
12. Understanding	5.31	6.63	N.S.	5.46	6.25	N.S.	4.77	6.38	N.S.
13. Counteraction	6.38	7.25	N.S.	6.46	6.25	N.S.	6.23	7.25	N.S.
14. Achievement	5.62	7.00	N.S.	5.62	6.63	N.S.	5.62	6.38	N.S.
15. Reflectiveness	6.00	5.38	N.S.	5.92	5.50	N.S.	5.69	4.88	N.S.
16. Humanism	6.77	5.88	N.S.	5.31	4.63	N.S.	4.34	4.00	N.S.
17. Scientism	5.08	6.88	N.S.	4.85	6.88	N.S.	5.00	6.63	N.S.
18. Objectivity	7.77	6.38	N.S.	7.00	6.63	N.S.	6.92	6.38	N.S.
19. Affiliation	7.23	6.50	N.S.	6.77	5.88	N.S.	6.46	5.63	N.S.
20. Nurturance	7.92	7.63	N.S.	8.08	6.75	2.08*	6.85	6.75	N.S.
21. Succorance	7.38	6.50	N.S.	8.00	5.75	2.52**	7.62	5.63	1.94*
22. Conjunctivity	6.69	6.13	N.S.	6.46	5.88	N.S.	5.62	5.75	N.S.

TABLE 348

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON SAI SCORES[1]

(CONT)

Need Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t
23. Aggression	2.69	2.75	N.S.	3.08	2.75	N.S.	3.08	2.25	N.S.
24. Dominance	4.46	3.88	N.S.	4.46	3.88	N.S.	5.15	3.25	2.32**
25. Narcissism	5.08	6.00	N.S.	5.23	5.63	N.S.	5.00	5.63	N.S.
26. Fantasied Achievement	5.92	6.25	N.S.	6.00	6.25	N.S.	5.23	6.75	N.S.
27. Ego Achievement	3.77	4.00	N.S.	4.77	3.88	N.S.	5.38	3.88	N.S.
28. Exhibitionism	3.85	3.63	N.S.	4.00	3.62	N.S.	5.00	4.50	N.S.
29. Impulsion	4.46	4.13	N.S.	3.77	4.63	N.S.	4.77	4.38	N.S.
30. Emotionality	2.38	2.5	N.S.	2.46	2.13	N.S.	2.77	2.75	N.S.
31. Prudery	6.92	5.63	N.S.	6.54	6.63	N.S.	6.31	7.13	N.S.
32. Sameness	3.46	4.38	N.S.	3.62	3.00	N.S.	3.46	3.13	N.S.
33. Passivity	4.08	4.13	N.S.	3.69	3.88	N.S.	4.00	3.50	N.S.
34. Rejection	2.38	2.88	N.S.	2.15	3.75	2.39**	3.38	3.75	N.S.
35. Autonomy	2.69	4.25	2.02*	2.00	4.25	2.52**	2.38	4.38	1.95*
36. Disjunctivity	3.31	3.88	N.S.	3.54	4.13	N.S.	4.38	4.25	N.S.
37. Blamavoidance	7.38	7.27	N.S.	6.92	7.25	N.S.	6.92	7.75	N.S.
38. Infavoidance	4.92	4.50	N.S.	4.62	5.13	N.S.	4.08	4.25	N.S.
39. Deliberation	5.54	5.88	N.S.	6.23	5.38	N.S.	5.23	5.63	N.S.
40. Placidity	7.62	7.5	N.S.	7.54	7.88	N.S.	7.23	7.25	N.S.

N = 13.8
df = 19
*** .01 > 2.861
** .05 > 2.093
* .10 > 1.729

[1] Unmatched *t* test

These findings represent initial heterogeneity between the male subjects of the two groups. It is an appreciably smaller occurrence of variation than that obtained on the total group comparison (Table 347). The three variables which show significance are of divergent natures and do not seem to express any consistent pattern. It also represents considerably less initial variability than that obtained on the analysis of variance for the total experimental group (Tables 283-290).

A slight increase in variation between the two male sub-groups occured on the post-counseling SAI data. Differences obtained were: at the .01 level of significance, 11 - Harmavoidance; at the .05 level, 21 - Succorance, 34 - Rejection and 34 - Autonomy; and at the .10 level, 20 - Nurturance.

In two of these variables, 11 - Harmavoidance and 34 - Autonomy, significance is also obtained at a critical level on the pre-counseling administration. Significant differences between the two male sub-groups are maintained and established in need variables related essentially to human interaction dynamics, a pattern very similar to that noted for the full group comparison (Table 347) as well as some aspects of the GSC findings previously noted.

As on the pre-test comparison, a lesser frequency of difference exists when the fathers in these two clinic treatment groups are directly contrasted on this t - test comparison than on the overall analysis of variance of the same subjects in Question 5 (Tables 302-312). This pattern is the opposite of that noted in the results from the two questions in the majority of other instances (both instruments and population sub-groups).

The results after the post-counseling period provided significant differences in four of the need variables: none at the .01 level; 11 - Harmavoidance and 24 - Dominance at the .05 level; and 21 - Succorance and 35 - Autonomy at the .10 level.

These differences occur in categories which show variation between the two groups on either Test I and/or II except for 24 - Dominance. The emphasis of the variables showing significance in the interactive areas is consistent with previous comments. Again, the occurrence of significance between these two major clinic groups is much less than that noted for the intra-experimental group in Question 5 (Tables 321-331). This observation lends further support to the suggestion that if significant differences on the SAI exist within the experimental group they do not initially appear in contradistinction to each other according to the Concentrated versus Distributed counseling treatment breakdown. Neither do such patterns appear either as an immediate (Test II) or a more delayed (Test III) effect of the different spacing of counseling treatment provided the two groups. Differences between the two groups do not appreciably vary in frequency or area for any of the three periods.

On the comparison of the female subjects on SAI scores (Table 349), initial differences were found: at the .01 level for variables 18 - Objectivity, 20 - Nurturance, 24 - Dominance and 34 - Rejection; at the .05 level for 19 - Affiliation and 23 - Aggression; and at the .10 level for 8 - Abasement, 13 - Counteraction, 14 - Achievement, 30 - Emotionality and 40 - Placidity.

These areas represent a greater variety of the dynamics of behavior than those indicating differences for either the total group or the male sub-group, both of which were homogeneous in content area. Variation between the female subjects seems to initially exist in areas related to achievement and goals, personal interaction patterns and personal-emotional adjustment. This also indicates a greater frequency of initial differences in contrast to that noted for either the total group comparison (Table 347) or the male sub-group (Table 348). Only four variables show initial significance in the consideration of Question 5 (Tables 291-294), in contrast to eleven in this comparison. It seems that intra-group variation which specifically exists between these two clinic groups is not detected by the analysis of variance treatment.

TABLE 349

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON SAI SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t
1. Sentience	3.60	3.55	N.S.	4.00	2.18	2.77***	3.80	3.00	N.S.
2. Sex	3.30	2.09	N.S.	3.80	3.09	N.S.	3.35	1.73	N.S.
3. Change	6.35	6.27	N.S.	7.15	5.91	2.20**	6.50	6.00	N.S.
4. Play	4.75	5.00	N.S.	5.20	5.09	N.S.	5.30	5.36	N.S.
5. Energy	5.15	5.27	N.S.	5.40	4.91	N.S.	5.45	5.27	N.S.
6. Pragmatism	7.30	6.55	N.S.	7.60	7.45	N.S.	7.20	7.18	N.S.
7. Adaptiveness	3.85	3.45	N.S.	3.25	2.27	N.S.	3.20	2.91	N.S.
8. Abasement	4.05	3.27	1.72*	3.70	2.91	N.S.	3.45	3.82	N.S.
9. Deference	7.10	6.82	N.S.	7.40	7.27	N.S.	7.20	6.55	N.S.
10. Order	6.30	6.64	N.S.	6.10	6.91	N.S.	6.50	6.45	N.S.
11. Harmavoidance	8.35	8.27	N.S.	7.80	8.27	N.S.	8.35	8.82	N.S.
12. Understanding	5.25	4.45	N.S.	5.60	5.27	N.S.	5.35	5.27	N.S.
13. Counteraction	5.65	4.36	1.92*	5.40	4.27	1.99*	5.75	4.55	1.71*
14. Achievement	5.00	3.45	2.03*	5.15	3.45	1.99*	5.00	3.64	N.S.
15. Reflectiveness	5.45	6.09	N.S.	5.75	6.09	N.S.	5.75	6.27	N.S.
16. Humanism	5.10	4.55	N.S.	5.45	4.45	N.S.	5.35	4.64	N.S.
17. Scientism	3.05	3.36	N.S.	2.45	2.55	N.S.	2.80	2.27	N.S.
18. Objectivity	6.00	8.27	2.94***	6.15	7.82	1.89*	6.00	7.82	2.53**
19. Affiliation	7.55	5.64	2.58**	7.80	5.00	4.73***	7.55	5.36	2.91***
20. Nurturance	8.90	7.36	12.83***	8.70	7.27	2.37**	8.50	7.27	N.S.
21. Succorance	7.45	7.09	N.S.	7.70	7.27	N.S.	7.15	6.82	N.S.
22. Conjunctivity	6.10	5.55	N.S.	6.15	5.55	N.S.	5.75	5.18	N.S.

TABLE 349

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONCENTRATED AND THE DISTRIBUTED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON SAI SCORES[1]

(CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t	Conc. $\bar{\bar{X}}$	Dist. $\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t
23. Aggression	1.45	2.73	2.29**	1.75	2.82	1.72*	1.50	2.36	N.S.
24. Dominance	4.30	2.55	4.69***	3.25	3.64	N.S.	3.45	3.00	N.S.
25. Narcissism	5.40	5.36	N.S.	4.10	5.82	N.S.	5.85	5.55	N.S.
26. Fantasied Achievement	5.45	4.73	N.S.	5.25	4.91	N.S.	4.95	5.36	N.S.
27. Ego Achievement	4.45	4.09	N.S.	3.90	4.64	N.S.	4.05	4.73	N.S.
28. Exhibitionism	3.20	2.91	N.S.	3.25	3.36	N.S.	3.75	2.73	N.S.
29. Impulsion	4.30	4.55	N.S.	4.80	5.64	N.S.	4.75	4.36	N.S.
30. Emotionality	3.00	4.18	1.88*	3.90	3.91	N.S.	4.45	4.09	N.S.
31. Prudery	6.70	7.00	N.S.	6.20	6.91	N.S.	6.65	8.27	N.S.
32. Sameness	3.65	3.64	N.S.	2.85	4.09	2.20**	3.50	4.00	N.S.
33. Passivity	4.60	4.73	N.S.	4.60	5.09	N.S.	4.55	4.72	N.S.
34. Rejection	2.05	3.55	2.79***	1.75	3.82	3.93***	1.95	3.73	3.12***
35. Autonomy	2.55	2.91	N.S.	2.30	2.73	N.S.	2.35	3.18	N.S.
36. Disjunctivity	3.90	4.45	N.S.	3.85	4.45	N.S.	4.25	4.82	N.S.
37. Blamavoidance	8.55	7.55	N.S.	8.25	7.18	1.76*	8.50	7.64	N.S.
38. Infavoidance	5.60	6.36	N.S.	5.65	6.18	N.S.	5.30	6.55	2.19**
39. Deliberation	5.60	5.45	N.S.	5.20	4.91	N.S.	5.25	5.64	N.S.
40. Placidity	7.00	5.82	1.88*	4.00	6.09	1.92*	6.35	6.27	N.S.

N = 20.11
df = 29
*** .01 $>$ 2.756
** .05 $>$ 2.045
* .10 $>$ 1.699

[1] Unmatched *t* test

On the post-counseling administration, significant differences between the mothers of the two groups are present in variable 1 - Sentience, 19 - Affiliation and 34 - Rejection at the .01 level, 3 - Change, 20 - Nurturance and 32 - Sameness at the .05 level, and 13 - Counteraction, 14 - Achievement, 18 - Objectivity, 23 - Aggression, 37 - Blamavoidance and 40 - Placidity at the .10 level.

For the most part variation between the females of the two groups seems unaltered by the different time schema employed in counseling treatment. Heterogeneity between the two groups remains in eight of the original variables. The more personally oriented items tend to diminish in differences between the two groups whereas variables related to interpersonal relations seem to maintain their significance. The same contrast pattern secured for Administration I in the related comparison of Question 5 (Tables 314-316) is repeated for this post-counseling comparison.

The frequency of significant differences obtained on the form administered 6-9 months following counseling termination was somewhat lessened in contrast to that of Test I and II (Table 349). Significant t's at the .01 level were obtained for variables 19 - Affiliation and 34 - Rejection, at the .05 level for 18 - Objectivity and 38 - Infavoidance, and at the .10 level for 13 - Counteraction.

With one exception, 38 - Infavoidance, all variables which are significant between the Concentrated and Distributed clinic female subgroups are significant for the entire period (Tests I, II, and III). The major diminution of variation seems to have taken place in the interaction oriented variables. The post-counseling period seems to have effected a significant alteration of need personality variables measured by the SAI. Increased homogeneity between the two counseling groups is observed both by the decrease in the occurrence of significant t-ratios and by the minimal appearance of new variation. This pattern is noted only in the female sub-group. For the total group and the male sub-group, decrease in variation is minimal but neither is initial nor post-counseling heterogeneity so pronounced.

Differences obtained are greater than those which would be expected by chance. It is apparent that the patterns between the two counseling treatment groups seem to show more consistent variation, more consistently on variables that are basically related to the individual personality patterns (GSC and SAI) than those specific areas tapped by the PARI and the AMR.

These more specific aspects seem more amenable to change by counseling treatment and the post-counseling interim period. Generally, the female sub-groups have shown more variation and change than have the male sub-groups.

QUESTION 7. WHAT ARE THE DIFFERENCES IN ATTITUDES AND NEED PERSONALITY STRUCTURE BETWEEN FATHERS AND MOTHERS OF EDUCABLE MENTALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN?

It was suggested that differences in the dynamic patterns of attitude and need personality structure might exist between the mother and the father segments of the population initially and/or as an outgrowth of the counseling experience. Support for this assumption has been noted in the different patterns and frequency of variation noted in the sub-group comparisons in many of the preceding questions. In order to test whether such differences exist, an unmatched t-test was applied at the various testing periods within each of the groups: Cazenovia, Minnowbrook, Twice a Month, Once a Month, Control, Clinic Dropout, Attrition, and Contact.

A. Cazenovia Group

1. Discomfort Relief Quotient (DRQ) (Table 350).

Only one set of data, the pre-test, was available for consideration as the interview was only administered once to the subjects.

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE
CAZENOVIA GROUP ON DRQ SCORES[1]

Categories	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	
1. Intra-Family	37.66	50.66	N.S.	
2. Neighborhood	48.16	61.16	2.22*	
3. Activity-Goals	39.66	45.33	N.S.	
4. Community	70.66	68.66	N.S.	
5. Parental Relationships	50.33	37.50	N.S.	

N = 6,6
df = 10
***.01 > 3.169
**.05 > 2.228
*.10 > 1.812

[1] Unmatched *t* test

A significant difference between the two sex sub-groups on DRQ scores was found for category 2 - Neighborhood at the .10 level. Further differences at more critical levels were not obtained.

This incidence of significance at the less critical .10 level can be considered minimal. It is interesting to note, however, that this variation occurs in the 2 - Neighborhood category. Perhaps the generally lessened contact of the fathers with every day neighborhood activities and dynamics in contrast to that of the mothers is the factor precipitating this observed tendency toward significant differences.

2. Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI) (Table 351).

On the comparison of the pre-counseling PARI scores, significant differences between the male and female subjects occurred in only one instance, category 17 - Expression of Affection at the .05 level. No differences at either the .01 or the .10 levels were observed.

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE
CAZENOVIA GROUP ON PARI SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
1. Encouraging Verbalization	18.16	18.33	N.S.	18.66	19.16	N.S.	18.50	18.83	N.S.
2. Fostering Dependency	12.00	9.33	N.S.	10.50	10.67	N.S.	11.00	11.33	N.S.
3. Seclusiveness	11.50	11.00	N.S.	11.67	10.50	N.S.	11.00	11.67	N.S.
4. Breaking the Will	10.17	7.83	N.S.	9.17	7.50	N.S.	9.17	9.00	N.S.
5. Marital Conflict	16.00	16.67	N.S.	16.17	15.17	N.S.	16.50	14.17	2.12*
6. Strictness	13.00	13.67	N.S.	12.50	12.67	N.S.	13.17	14.67	N.S.

TABLE 351

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE CAZENOVIA GROUP ON PARI SCORES[1]
(CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
7. Irritability	14.50	14.00	N.S.	14.17	13.67	N.S.	14.00	14.50	N.S.
8. Excluding Outside Influences	12.83	11.83	N.S.	11.33	9.67	N.S.	12.00	9.83	N.S.
9. Deification of Parent	13.33	11.83	N.S.	13.50	11.33	N.S.	12.50	12.33	N.S.
10. Suppression of Aggression	9.83	10.17	N.S.	9.67	9.83	N.S.	9.67	10.67	N.S.
11. Equalitarianism	18.33	17.17	N.S.	18.33	17.83	N.S.	17.83	18.00	N.S.
12. Avoidance of Communication	11.17	11.00	N.S.	10.33	9.33	N.S.	9.83	8.67	N.S.
13. Inconsid'ness	13.33	10.83	N.S.	13.50	12.33	N.S.	13.33	13.17	N.S.
14. Suppression of Sexuality	9.50	8.33	N.S.	8.33	8.00	N.S.	7.83	8.33	N.S.
15. Ascendancy	9.83	10.00	N.S.	9.17	10.67	N.S.	10.17	10.67	N.S.
16. Comradeship	18.50	17.50	N.S.	18.17	19.00	N.S.	18.16	18.66	N.S.
17. Expression of Affection	16.50	19.50	2.96**	16.17	19.67	4.07***	16.33	19.33	2.18*
18. Autonomy of Child	18.50	19.16	N.S.	18.33	19.33	N.S.	18.00	18.33	N.S.
19. Achievement	24.83	20.83	N.S.	22.83	19.33	N.S.	24.33	22.50	N.S.

N = 6.6
df = 10
***.01 > 3.169
**.05 > 2.228
*.10 > 1.812

[1] Unmatched t test

For the first post-counseling administration differences were again observed only in category 17 - Expression of Affection, at the .01 level of significance. No differences at the .05 or .10 level were found.

It would seem that the counseling experience has no noticeable effect on behavioral patterns other than the increase in the critical level of the significant category.

For the third test administration, significant differences between the males and females existed at the .10 level in two of the categories: 5 - Marital Conflict and 17 - Expression of Affection. No differences at the .01 or .05 levels occurred.

Obviously, only negligible change has been effected between the two Cazenovia sub-groups in the no-contact period. The most concentrated counseling treatment seems to have had no significant effect upon the alteration of attitudes toward children and child-rearing according to PARI scores for male and female subjects either immediately following the counseling experience or after a period of time.

3. Attitude Scale Toward Mental Retardation (AMR) (Table 352).

Significant variation between the male and female segments on AMR scores was obtained in one category, 16 - Emotional-Social Behavior, at the .05 level. No further differences were derived at the .01 and .10 levels. Initial variation within the Cazenovia group between the two sex components on attitudes toward retardation would thus seem to be minor.

TABLE 352

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE CAZENOVIA GROUP ON AMR SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
1. Sexuality	6.83	7.67	N.S.	7.33	7.33	N.S.	8.33	7.17	N.S.
2. Genetic Responsibility	4.67	4.17	N.S.	4.50	4.50	N.S.	4.00	4.50	N.S.
3. Appearance	4.33	4.33	N.S.	4.00	4.00	N.S.	4.17	4.50	N.S.
4. Normalcy of Development	36.83	37.00	N.S.	39.66	39.00	N.S.	37.16	39.16	N.S.
5. Dependency	21.16	20.16	N.S.	21.50	20.16	N.S.	23.33	20.66	N.S.
6. Independency	28.33	27.66	N.S.	28.50	27.00	N.S.	27.66	26.66	N.S.
7. Aggression	14.83	14.50	N.S.	14.67	15.00	N.S.	15.83	15.00	N.S.
8. Guilt	21.33	19.33	N.S.	20.66	20.33	N.S.	21.66	19.66	N.S.
9. Peer Interaction	26.00	26.66	N.S.	25.66	26.00	N.S.	26.83	28.00	N.S.
10. Concept of Retardation	29.33	29.83	N.S.	29.33	28.50	N.S.	27.50	28.16	N.S.
11. Abasement	25.00	25.00	N.S.	25.66	27.00	N.S.	29.83	27.50	N.S.
12. Comprehension of Self/Others	14.67	15.17	N.S.	14.83	14.83	N.S.	15.33	15.33	N.S.
13. Counteraction	24.83	24.50	N.S.	23.66	24.50	N.S.	23.00	23.33	N.S.
14. Educational Implications and Training	20.66	23.00	N.S.	24.00	24.00	N.S.	23.16	21.33	N.S.
15. Community Provision	15.83	14.83	N.S.	16.33	15.33	N.S.	16.50	15.67	N.S.
16. Emotional-Social Behavior	24.00	20.66	2.84**	22.83	22.33	N.S.	25.16	20.50	2.57**
17. Expression of Affection	18.33	18.66	N.S.	19.33	19.50	N.S.	18.83	19.50	N.S.
18. Suppression of Sex	8.33	7.33	N.S.	8.50	7.33	N.S.	8.67	7.33	N.S.

TABLE 352

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE CAZENOVIA GROUP ON AMR SCORES[1]

(CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives		$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
19. Encouraging Verbalization	17.33	17.00	N.S.	18.16	18.00	N.S.	18.83	18.50	N.S.
20. Excluding Outside Influences	9.50	9.50	N.S.	10.67	8.33	N.S.	10.50	9.00	N.S.
21. Avoidance of Communication	10.83	9.83	N.S.	10.83	8.00	2.12*	10.00	7.67	N.S.
22. Suppression of Aggression	9.83	10.50	N.S.	9.33	8.17	N.S.	9.33	8.17	N.S.
23. Deification	14.00	12.33	N.S.	15.50	10.67	N.S.	13.67	18.33	N.S.
24. Comradeship and Sharing	17.16	16.66	N.S.	19.33	19.33	N.S.	17.66	19.00	N.S.
25. Strictness	10.83	11.50	N.S.	12.17	12.50	N.S.	12.67	13.17	N.S.
26. Breaking the Will	9.00	9.00	N.S.	8.33	9.00	N.S.	8.83	6.83	N.S.
27. Irritability	14.50	12.17	N.S.	15.00	14.50	N.S.	15.83	13.83	N.S.
28. Autonomy of Child	17.83	16.66	N.S.	18.33	18.66	N.S.	18.00	18.50	N.S.
29. Equalitarianism	17.83	17.50	N.S.	17.50	18.50	N.S.	17.50	17.83	N.S.
30. Approval of Activity	11.83	12.33	N.S.	11.67	13.50	N.S.	14.17	13.67	N.S.
31. Fostering Dependency	12.17	9.83	N.S.	12.00	9.67	N.S.	11.67	11.00	N.S.
32. Acceleration of Development	10.67	11.33	N.S.	12.00	10.50	N.S.	12.67	11.50	N.S.
33. Achievement	21.33	21.66	N.S.	20.20	19.30	N.S.	22.16	20.00	N.S.

N = 6,6
df = 10
***.01>3.169
**.05>2.228
*.10>1.812

[1] Unmatched t test

On Administration II, significant t-test differences were found between the males and females in one category, 21 - Avoidance of Communication at the .10 level. No differences at the .01 or .05 levels were obtained. The immediate effect of counseling did not create significant differences between these two sub-groups of the Cazenovia clinic group on items containing specific reference to retardation as measured by the AMR scale.

On the third test administration, the observed differences occurred again in category 16 - Emotional-Social Behavior at the .05 level. No further differences at the .01 or .10 levels occurred.

The post-counseling period seems to have afforded an opportunity for initial patterns of sexual variation to become re-established. The disappearance of differences noted for 21 - Avoidance of Communication immediately following counseling also suggests the lack of permanence of variation between these two groups created by the concentrated counseling experience.

For the overall pattern, negligible differences initially exist on AMR scores between the Cazenovia male and female subjects. Further, the concentrated counseling treatment afforded this group produces minor shifts in the pattern between the two on attitudes having a specific reference to retardation. Any change created seems temporary as original patterns are re-established 6-9 months after counseling.

4. Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC): Variable Scores. (Table 353).

A trend toward significant variation between the male and female subjects on the pre-counseling administration occurred on one GSC variable, 22 - Order at the .10 level. No further differences were obtained at the .01 levels of significance. It would seem that only slight variation between the sexes exists in the Cazenovia group on the variables measured by the Gradient Sentence Completion Test prior to counseling treatment.

TABLE 353

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE CAZENOVIA GROUP ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1]

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
1. Abasement	2.33	2.17	N.S.	1.67	2.33	N.S.	3.83	3.50	N.S.
2. Achievement	16.17	17.33	N.S.	18.83	18.83	N.S.	20.66	16.17	N.S.
3. Acquiescence	11.50	9.83	N.S.	13.67	13.00	N.S.	16.50	15.00	N.S.
4. Acquisition	3.33	1.33	N.S.	4.33	1.67	2.49**	1.83	1.17	N.S.
5. Affiliation	12.33	15.17	N.S.	13.17	15.00	N.S.	12.17	13.17	N.S.
6. Aggression	4.00	4.67	N.S.	4.00	2.67	N.S.	2.00	4.50	4.03***
7. Autonomy	1.00	.50	N.S.	1.67	1.50	N.S.	1.17	2.67	N.S.
8. Avoidance	2.67	1.33	N.S.	2.17	.83	N.S.	1.67	1.50	N.S.
9. Benignness	5.00	8.00	N.S.	4.67	6.17	N.S.	5.33	9.33	N.S.
10. Counteraction	1.00	1.00	N.S.	.83	1.50	N.S.	1.17	1.33	N.S.
11. Deference	2.50	2.50	N.S.	4.67	3.67	N.S.	3.17	1.50	N.S.
12. Description	3.17	5.33	N.S.	4.00	4.00	N.S.	5.00	5.50	N.S.
13. Dominance	4.67	2.83	N.S.	4.33	5.33	N.S.	6.00	3.83	1.86*
14. Identification	2.00	2.50	N.S.	2.17	3.17	N.S.	1.67	2.17	N.S.
15. Integrity	4.17	3.67	N.S.	3.00	2.00	N.S.	4.33	2.83	N.S.
16. Intellectual	5.00	3.83	N.S.	7.33	5.17	N.S.	4.67	3.67	N.S.
17. Irritability	4.83	3.67	N.S.	3.17	3.33	N.S.	2.67	3.00	N.S.
18. Narcissism	.83	.33	N.S.	1.00	1.00	N.S.	.67	1.33	N.S.
19. Nurturance	14.67	12.50	N.S.	12.33	11.33	N.S.	14.17	14.00	N.S.
20. Omission	3.33	3.17	N.S.	.67	4.00	2.37**	1.50	1.67	N.S.
21. Optimism	1.67	.67	N.S.	.83	1.33	N.S.	1.00	.83	N.S.
22. Order	2.50	1.83	1.84*	1.83	2.50	N.S.	3.33	2.00	N.S.
23. Pessimism	2.00	.50	N.S.	.50	0	N.S.	.50	.33	N.S.
24. Phobia	2.17	1.83	N.S.	2.83	1.83	N.S.	.83	1.83	N.S.
25. Play	4.00	2.50	N.S.	3.50	2.83	N.S.	2.83	1.83	N.S.
26. Refusal	2.67	2.67	N.S.	3.00	1.83	N.S.	4.50	3.83	N.S.
27. Rejection	6.00	7.50	N.S.	8.00	10.00	N.S.	9.33	6.50	N.S.

TABLE 353

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE CAZENOVIA GROUP ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1] (CONT)

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	X Husb.	Y Wives	t	X Husb.	Y Wives	t	X Husb.	Y Wives	t
28. Seclusion	.67	.83	N.S.	.50	.67	N.S.	.17	1.00	N.S.
29. Sentience	10.33	10.00	N.S.	8.33	8.67	N.S.	8.83	8.50	N.S.
30. Sex	.50	0	N.S.	.67	0	N.S.	.50	0	N.S.
31. Submissiveness	1.00	.50	N.S.	.67	.33	N.S.	.17	.33	N.S.
32. Succorance	3.67	3.17	N.S.	5.17	2.83	N.S.	4.83	3.00	N.S.
33. Supernatural	3.67	2.67	N.S.	2.83	1.33	N.S.	2.00	1.33	N.S.
34. Understanding	4.33	5.67	N.S.	1.50	6.33	2.23**	3.67	6.83	2.09*
35. Unhappiness	1.00	1.50	N.S.	1.17	2.50	N.S.	1.17	3.00	N.S.

N = 6,6
df = 10
***.01 > 3.169
**.05 > 2.228
*.10 > 1.812

[1] Unmatched *t* test

In the comparison of the category variable scores immediately following termination of the concentrated counseling experience, significant t ratios at the .05 level were obtained in three instances: category 4 - Acquisition, 20 - Omission and 34 - Understanding. No additional differences were obtained at the .01 or the .10 confidence limits.

This somewhat increased variability between the two sex groups after counseling seems to appear in rather divergent category areas encompassing both the material and the more personally oriented topics. The significance of the 20 - Omission variable reflects a differentiation in the effect of the counseling experience upon the spontaneity of expression of the two groups.

On the third administration, pertinent differences between the mothers and fathers existed on three of the 35 category variables: 6 - Aggression at the .01 level; and 13 - Dominance and 34 - Understanding at the .10 level. No differences appeared at the .05 level.

None of these variables show variation between the two sexes on either the pre- or the post-counseling test scores. A more generalized pattern is indicated in areas related to aspects of relationships with others.

While the increase in the frequency of significance between the fathers and mothers on GSC variable scores does not generally extend beyond the limits attributable to chance, the increase on Test II and III should be noted. It is possible that the concentrated counseling treatment provided the Cazenovia group influences the increase in variation. While there is no appreciable alteration of patterns after the post-counseling period it should be pointed out that change has occurred in two ways - the disappearance of significant variation in the three category variables exhibiting some divergence immediately following counseling and the development of significant inter-sex variability in three additional variables.

5. Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC): Direction Scores. (Table 354)

No significant differences were obtained between the two sex groups of the Cazenovia clinic group at any of the three levels for any of the three administration periods. Thus it seems that no initial significant differences on the direction scores exist between the two groups prior to counseling; that the concentrated counseling treatment has no immediate effect of increasing variation between the two sexes; and that the period following counseling does not alter patterns sufficiently to increase intersex variability within the Cazenovia group.

TABLE 354

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE CAZENOVIA GROUP ON GSC DIRECTION SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
1. Positive	86.00	80.16	N.S.	85.66	86.50	N.S.	87.50	85.83	N.S.
2. Negative	55.50	53.66	N.S.	58.33	53.50	N.S.	54.83	56.00	N.S.
3. Neutral	7.50	15.17	N.S.	5.67	9.00	N.S.	6.67	7.17	N.S.

N = 6,6
df = 10
***.01 > 3.169
**.05 > 2.228
*.10 > 1.812

[1] Unmatched t test

6. Stern Activities Index (SAI) (Table 355)

Initial significance on the unmatched t-test comparison of the Cazenovia male and female SAI scores was found at the .01 level for one need variable, 16 - Humanism, and at the .10 level for 17 - Scientism. Differences at the .05 level did not occur. This limited frequency of significant variation between the two sub-groups seems to reflect a basic homogeneity within the Cazenovia group sex components on initial SAI scores.

TABLE 355

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE CAZENOVIA GROUP ON SAI SCORES[1]

Need Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	X Husb.	Y Wives	t	X Husb.	Y Wives	t	X Husb.	Y Wives	t
1. Sentience	3.33	4.00	N.S.	3.33	4.17	N.S.	3.83	3.67	N.S.
2. Sex	3.67	3.50	N.S.	3.67	2.83	N.S.	4.33	2.83	N.S.
3. Change	6.50	6.83	N.S.	6.33	7.33	N.S.	6.00	6.17	N.S.
4. Play	3.50	5.00	N.S.	3.83	5.33	N.S.	3.83	4.83	N.S.
5. Energy	6.50	5.83	N.S.	6.17	6.33	N.S.	6.17	5.50	N.S.
6. Pragmatism	8.67	7.33	N.S.	8.33	7.67	N.S.	6.33	6.67	N.S.
7. Adaptiveness	2.83	3.17	N.S.	3.83	2.33	N.S.	2.67	2.33	N.S.
8. Abasement	3.66	3.83	N.S.	4.17	2.83	N.S.	4.33	2.83	N.S.
9. Deference	6.33	6.83	N.S.	7.50	7.33	N.S.	6.83	6.83	N.S.
10. Order	5.67	5.67	N.S.	6.00	5.83	N.S.	5.50	5.83	N.S.
11. Harmavoidance	7.83	9.33	N.S.	8.33	8.50	N.S.	7.17	9.17	N.S.
12. Understanding	6.33	5.00	N.S.	6.50	5.33	N.S.	5.17	5.50	N.S.
13. Counteraction	6.67	6.00	N.S.	5.83	6.00	N.S.	5.50	6.50	N.S.
14. Achievement	5.67	5.67	N.S.	5.50	5.83	N.S.	5.33	5.00	N.S.
15. Reflectiveness	7.17	5.17	N.S.	6.83	5.33	N.S.	5.67	4.83	N.S.
16. Humanism	6.83	3.33	3.17***	6.17	4.50	N.S.	5.17	3.83	N.S.
17. Scientism	5.67	2.17	2.20*	6.00	1.83	2.64**	5.83	1.33	3.83***
18. Objectivity	7.00	7.33	N.S.	7.00	7.50	N.S.	7.17	7.33	N.S.
19. Affiliation	6.17	7.00	N.S.	5.67	7.67	N.S.	5.83	7.67	N.S.
20. Nurturance	8.00	8.17	N.S.	7.83	8.67	N.S.	7.33	7.83	N.S.
21. Succorance	8.00	7.00	N.S.	7.67	7.00	N.S.	7.50	6.67	N.S.
22. Conjunctivity	6.17	6.33	N.S.	6.50	6.00	N.S.	6.00	5.83	N.S.
23. Aggression	3.00	1.33	N.S.	3.67	1.50	2.44**	3.17	.83	3.31***
24. Dominance	5.17	3.50	N.S.	5.17	2.50	3.04**	5.83	2.50	4.02***
25. Narcissism	6.50	4.83	N.S.	6.33	5.33	N.S.	5.67	5.00	N.S.
26. Fantasied Achievement	6.67	5.00	N.S.	7.17	4.83	N.S.	6.67	4.33	N.S.

TABLE 355

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE CAZENOVIA GROUP ON SAI SCORES[1]

(CONT)

Need Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
27. Ego Achievement	5.17	3.83	N.S.	5.83	2.83	3.10**	6.50	2.83	2.24**
28. Exhibitionism	4.33	3.17	N.S.	4.00	3.33	N.S.	6.00	3.33	1.97*
29. Impulsion	5.17	4.50	N.S.	4.00	4.33	N.S.	4.83	3.00	N.S.
30. Emotionality	3.50	2.83	N.S.	2.67	3.83	N.S.	3.33	6.00	N.S.
31. Prudery	5.67	6.50	N.S.	6.33	7.17	N.S.	5.67	7.17	N.S.
32. Sameness	3.50	3.17	N.S.	3.67	2.67	N.S.	4.00	3.83	N.S.
33. Passivity	3.50	4.17	N.S.	3.50	3.67	N.S.	3.83	4.50	N.S.
34. Rejection	3.00	2.33	N.S.	3.33	1.83	N.S.	3.33	2.33	N.S.
35. Autonomy	2.17	3.00	N.S.	2.33	3.00	N.S.	2.50	3.33	N.S.
36. Disjunctivity	3.83	3.67	N.S.	3.50	4.00	N.S.	4.00	4.17	N.S.
37. Blameavoidance	7.00	8.67	N.S.	6.33	8.50	N.S.	6.83	9.17	N.S.
38. Infavoidance	4.50	5.33	N.S.	4.83	5.33	N.S.	3.67	5.08	N.S.
39. Deliberation	4.83	5.50	N.S.	6.00	5.67	N.S.	5.17	7.00	N.S.
40. Placidity	6.50	7.17	N.S.	7.33	6.17	N.S.	6.67	7.17	N.S.

N = 6,6
df = 10
***.01 > 3.169
**.05 > 2.228
*.10 > 1.812

[1] Unmatched *t* test

On the second administration variation between the two sexes appeared at the .05 level in four instances: 17 - Scientism (a carry-over from Test I), 23-Aggression, 24 - Dominance and 27 - Ego Achievement. No additional need variables were significant at the .01 or the .10 level.

Here, as was noted for the GSC variables, those with primary content emphasis upon interpersonal interactions show greater variation.

From a comparison of the two test periods it seems that the concentrated counseling experience contributed to this increase in inter-sex variation for the Cazenovia group.

On the third set of SAI scores obtained 6-9 months after the termination of the counseling experience, significant differences between the mother and father sub-groups were apparent at the .01 level for three need variables: 17 - Scientism, 23 - Aggression and 24 - Dominance; at the .05 level for one: 27 - Ego Achievement; and at the .10 level for one: 28 - Exhibitionism.

This represents an increase in both the frequency and the criticalness of the significance noted from the first post-counseling data. In only one instance, 28 - Exhibitionism, is the variation unique with this administration. One of the variables exhibits significance between the sexes for all three test administrations (17 - Scientism) and three for Tests I and II (23 - Aggression, 24 - Dominance, and 27 - Ego Achievement). It should be noted that the criticalness of the significance consistently maintains or increases but does not decrease with subsequent administrations. It seems that the post-counseling period served primarily as a reinforcement of patterns between the two sexes established by the concentrated counseling experience.

Differences between the male and female subjects comprising the Cazenovia clinic treatment group are for the most part minimal for the different testing periods. There is a greater tendency for an increase in variation with counseling on the more generalized personality-centered items of the GSC and the SAI than is noted for the PARI or the AMR items. Differences effected on the GSC and the SAI with counseling generally maintain themselves over the post-counseling period.

B. Minnowbrook Group

1. Discomfort Relief Quotient (DRQ). (Table 356)

On the t test comparison of the male and female Minnowbrook subjects on the DRQ, significant differences at the .10 level were observed for two of the interview categories, 1 - Intra-Family and 3 - Activity Goals. Further differences at the .01 or .05 levels did not occur. This occurrence indicates a tendency for significant variation between the two sex subgroups of the Minnowbrook population on aspects of familial adjustment.

TABLE 356

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE MINNOWBROOK GROUP ON DRQ SCORES[1]

Categories	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	
1. Intra-Family	45.85	59.86	2.03*	
2. Neighborhood	40.14	52.71	N.S.	
3. Activity-Goals	32.00	52.14	2.00*	
4. Community	80.14	72.28	N.S.	
5. Parental Relationships	44.42	51.50	N.S.	

N = 7.14
df = 19
***.01>2.861
**.05>2.093
*.10>1.734

[1] Unmatched *t* test

2. Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI). (Table 357)

Significant differences on the initial comparison of PARI scores were noted at the .01 level for categories 1 - Encouraging Verbalization, 15 - Ascendancy and 17 - Expression of Affection, and at the .05 level for 7 - Irritability and 16 - Comradeship and Sharing. No trends were obtained at the .10 level of significance.

TABLE 357

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE MINNOWBROOK GROUP ON PARI SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
1. Encouraging Verbalization	15.57	18.21	3.03***	17.28	18.93	2.16**	17.00	18.64	1.98*
2. Fostering Dependency	10.29	11.36	N.S.	11.57	11.36	N.S.	11.85	10.79	N.S.
3. Seclusiveness	10.43	12.00	N.S.	10.71	10.86	N.S.	9.43	10.86	N.S.
4. Breaking the Will	10.57	11.29	N.S.	9.71	9.36	N.S.	8.86	10.86	N.S.
5. Marital Conflict	13.86	14.93	N.S.	13.14	15.21	N.S.	14.00	15.64	N.S.
6. Strictness	13.14	14.43	N.S.	11.71	14.57	2.31**	12.57	14.29	N.S.
7. Irritability	11.86	14.57	2.44**	11.00	14.36	1.74*	11.00	14.36	2.11**
8. Excluding Outside Influences	11.29	12.50	N.S.	11.29	11.57	N.S.	11.43	11.57	N.S.
9. Deification of Parent	12.86	14.57	N.S.	12.29	14.36	N.S.	13.29	13.57	N.S.
10. Suppression of Aggression	9.86	11.00	N.S.	9.43	11.07	N.S.	9.00	10.71	N.S.
11. Equalitarianism	15.42	17.29	N.S.	17.00	18.50	N.S.	16.71	16.93	N.S.
12. Avoidance of Communication	10.14	11.00	N.S.	8.29	10.36	N.S.	8.57	11.29	2.64**
13. Inconsid'ness	11.43	12.43	N.S.	11.00	13.93	1.87*	11.29	13.71	2.35**

TABLE 357

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE MINNOWBROOK GROUP ON PARI SCORES[1] (CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
14. Suppression of Sexuality	10.57	10.14	N.S.	8.29	7.14	N.S.	8.71	8.64	N.S.
15. Ascendancy	8.71	13.36	3.44***	8.43	11.86	2.70**	9.86	12.86	N.S.
16. Comradeship and Sharing	17.28	18.93	2.45**	17.42	19.14	2.76**	17.14	18.36	N.S.
17. Expression of Affection	14.14	19.57	12.07***	15.00	19.79	9.58***	15.71	20.00	6.79***
18. Autonomy of Child	16.00	18.79	N.S.	16.00	19.29	4.17***	16.14	18.71	2.82**
19. Achievement	21.14	23.57	N.S.	21.28	22.93	N.S.	22.43	22.00	N.S.

N = 7,14
df = 19
***.01>2.861
**.05>2.093
*.10>1.734

[1] Unmatched *t* test

It would seem that initial variation between the two sex sub-groups on PARI scores relating to child-rearing attitudes exist prior to the counseling experience. Categories which indicate these initial differences relate to a variety of specific content areas - parental relationship with the child, goals for desirable parental behavior, parental reaction patterns to children's behavior and the concept of the role of the marital mate.

On the post-counseling analysis, significant differences between the two sex groups increased. Differences reaching significance at the .01 level were obtained in categories: 17 - Expression of Affection and 18 - Autonomy of the Child; at the .05 level in 1 - Encouraging Verbalization, 6 - Strictness, 15 - Ascendancy and 16 - Comradeship and Sharing; and at the less critical .10 level in 7 - Irritability and 13 - Inconsiderateness.

Variation is maintained at one of the critical levels of significance immediately after the weeklong counseling experience in all five categories. In addition, aspects relevant to child care and marital adjustment patterns seem to have been somewhat increased. For the most part the concentrated counseling treatment has a modicum effect in producing change between the two sex groups.

A slight diminution of significant differences occurred after the post-counseling period. Differences at the .01 level were obtained for one category, 17 - Expression of Affection. Differences reaching significance at the .05 level were obtained for categories 7 - Irritability, 12 - Avoidance of Communication, 13 - Inconsiderateness (of mate) and 18 - Autonomy of Child. Significance at the .10 level was reached for category 1 - Encouraging Verbalization.

Category 17 - Expression of Affection has maintained variability at the .01 level for all three test periods suggesting little or no impact of the counseling treatment on it. Category 7 - Irritability also consistently shows differences between the mothers and fathers for all three test administrations. In 12 - Avoidance of Communication, the variation is unique with the third test. In 13 - Inconsiderateness and 18 - Autonomy of Child, variation first reaches significance after counseling and maintains itself at a significant level for the period of time following the counseling. Category 1 - Encouraging Verbalization displays significance throughout the three administrations but at diminishing levels of criticalness. Significance noted in 6 - Strictness immediately following counseling is not maintained nor is that noted in 15 - Ascendancy or 16 - Comradeship and Sharing on both Tests I and II.

The influence of the post-counseling period on the pattern and frequency of differences between mothers and fathers on PARI scores seems to vary with different category areas. Generally, variation in items relating most directly to child-rearing practices is most impervious to the influence of counseling. However, fluctuation patterns relating to aspects of parental relationships show greater vascillation following the counseling. Generally little significant change in patterns is detected between mothers and fathers in the Minnowbrook group on PARI items.

3. Attitude Scale Toward Mental Retardation (AMR). (Table 358)

On the pre-counseling comparison of the male and female AMR scores, significant differences were found at the .05 level in three instances: categories 12 - Comprehension of Self and Others, 19 - Encouraging Verbalization and 29 - Equalitarianism. No additional differences attained statistical significance at either the .01 or the .10 levels.

TABLE 358

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE MINNOWBROOK GROUP ON AMR SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
1. Sexuality	10.43	11.21	N.S.	8.14	8.43	N.S.	9.29	10.14	N.S.
2. Genetic Responsibility	4.86	4.64	N.S.	4.71	5.21	N.S.	4.86	4.79	N.S.
3. Appearance	5.14	4.50	N.S.	4.71	4.79	N.S.	4.57	4.29	N.S.
4. Normalcy of Development	36.28	37.28	N.S.	38.14	40.29	N.S.	36.85	35.86	N.S.
5. Dependency	23.42	24.21	N.S.	21.85	21.86	N.S.	20.42	24.21	N.S.
6. Independency	26.00	25.93	N.S.	25.85	27.57	N.S.	26.71	26.57	N.S.
7. Aggression	17.71	18.71	N.S.	17.00	16.50	N.S.	15.14	16.64	N.S.
8. Guilt	19.14	18.86	N.S.	18.85	20.07	N.S.	19.14	20.64	N.S.

TABLE 358

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE MINNOWBROOK GROUP ON AMR SCORES[1] (CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
9. Peer Interaction	27.71	26.43	N.S.	25.85	26.71	N.S.	24.42	26.64	N.S.
10. Concept of Retardation	31.00	30.57	N.S.	25.85	29.93	N.S.	26.71	31.57	N.S.
11. Abasement	23.42	26.00	N.S.	24.00	24.36	N.S.	22.71	26.50	N.S.
12. Comprehension of Self/Others	15.57	19.64	2.22**	16.42	16.64	N.S.	15.85	17.71	N.S.
13. Counteraction	25.14	24.36	N.S.	24.28	23.79	N.S.	25.28	23.36	N.S.
14. Educational Implications and Training	25.28	26.93	N.S.	24.71	24.64	N.S.	22.71	24.29	N.S.
15. Community Provision	17.28	16.71	N.S.	16.85	15.36	N.S.	15.42	16.57	N.S.
16. Emotional-Social Behavior	28.57	29.29	N.S.	27.00	25.00	N.S.	23.42	26.64	3.21***
17. Expression of Affection	18.57	19.57	N.S.	18.71	19.64	N.S.	18.14	19.93	N.S.
18. Suppression of Sex	10.20	9.79	N.S.	7.29	8.29	N.S	7.86	9.14	N.S.
19. Encouraging Verbalization	15.00	17.64	2.26**	17.28	18.64	N.S.	17.57	17.50	N.S.
20. Excluding Outside Influences	11.29	11.71	N.S.	10.71	13.07	N.S.	8.57	11.57	1.82*
21. Avoidance of Communication	97.14	11.00	N.S.	9.14	8.93	N.S.	8.14	10.29	N.S.
22. Suppression of Aggression	10.86	11.93	N.S.	10.29	10.50	N.S.	9.29	11.07	N.S.
23. Deification	13.71	13.43	N.S.	13.86	15.57	N.S.	14.28	13.93	2.02*

TABLE 358

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE MINNOWBROOK GROUP ON AMR SCORES[1]
(CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
24. Comradeship and Sharing	16.42	18.86	N.S.	18.00	19.43	N.S.	18.28	18.07	N.S.
25. Strictness	12.71	14.00	N.S.	12.86	14.57	N.S.	13.86	14.29	N.S.
26. Breaking the Will	9.86	11.14	N.S.	9.86	10.00	N.S.	10.14	10.64	N.S.
27. Irritability	12.86	14.50	N.S.	11.00	14.21	1.81*	15.57	13.76	N.S.
28. Autonomy of Child	15.71	18.36	N.S.	17.28	19.14	N.S.	17.14	18.71	N.S.
29. Equalitarianism	14.85	17.29	2.44**	16.00	17.79	N.S.	14.42	17.36	2.64**
30. Approval of Activity	11.14	13.21	N.S.	12.86	11.36	N.S.	14.14	12.07	N.S.
31. Fostering Dependency	13.14	12.07	N.S.	12.57	12.36	N.S.	12.71	12.21	N.S.
32. Acceleration of Development	12.86	12.43	N.S.	14.14	13.00	N.S.	12.43	11.93	N.S.
33. Achievement	22.28	22.36	N.S.	21.14	21.21	N.S.	22.57	22.07	N.S.

N = 7.14
df = 19
***.01 > 2.861
**.05 > 2.093
*.10 > 1.734

[1] Unmatched *t* test

Thus, minimal initial variation between the two Minnowbrook subgroups appears on attitudes relevant to retardation as measured by the AMR. The content focus is centered upon aspects of philosophy and the parental handling of the retardate.

The t test comparison of the Minnowbrook mothers and fathers on post-counseling AMR scores yielded significant variation in only one category, 27 - Irritability, at the .10 level. No differences at the .01 or .05 levels were detected.

The week's counseling experience afforded the Minnowbrook group seems to have the immediate effect of minimizing the minor variation existing between the male and female subjects. None of the previously significant areas relevant to patterns of handling the retardate are maintained. The only area displaying significance, 27 - Irritability, is more specifically directed toward the reaction patterns of the parents to the condition of retardation.

On the third test administration, significance between the two groups was observed in four categories: 16 - Emotional-Social Behavior at the .01 level; 29 - Equalitarianism at the .05 level; and 20 - Excluding Outside Influences and 23 - Deification at the .10 level.

In only one instance does this represent either a continuance or a return to significant variation between the two sub-groups. Significance was shown for 29 - Equalitarianism at the same t-ratio prior to counseling. The decrease of variability after counseling would seem to have been of a temporary nature for this category. In the other areas indicating significant variation either at this or the preceding test period no definite patterns are observable. The post-counseling period shows the greatest frequency of variation. It would seem in noting the overall pattern that counseling has the immediate effect of making the mothers and fathers more homogeneous on attitudes toward retardation but this effect is temporary in that differences between the two again increase somewhat after a period of time.

4. Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC): Variable Scores. (Table 359)

The original scores obtained for the GSC variables showed differences between the Minnowbrook husband and wife sub-groups on two variables at the .05 level: 13 - Dominance and 16 - Intellectualism; and two at the .10 level: 28 - Seclusion and 34 - Understanding. No differences reached significance at the .01 level. The areas signifying some degree of divergence represent a heterogeneous pattern from items relating to self adjustment and relations with others to topics with more intellectually oriented content.

TABLE 359

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE MINNOWBROOK GROUP ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1]

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
1. Abasement	2.14	2.07	N.S.	2.29	2.57	N.S.	1.29	1.79	N.S.
2. Achievement	18.85	17.79	N.S.	19.14	21.43	N.S.	17.28	17.79	N.S.
3. Acquiescence	9.43	7.86	N.S.	10.00	9.64	N.S.	13.57	10.57	N.S.
4. Acquisition	1.43	1.43	N.S.	1.14	.71	N.S.	4.71	1.79	3.24***
5. Affiliation	11.86	14.00	N.S.	16.14	15.29	N.S.	14.57	14.64	N.S.
6. Aggression	2.57	3.57	N.S.	2.14	3.79	N.S.	4.14	3.71	N.S.
7. Autonomy	1.71	1.93	N.S.	1.86	1.00	N.S.	2.14	1.86	N.S.
8. Avoidance	1.86	.86	N.S.	2.00	8.57	2.12**	2.29	.57	2.03*
9. Benignness	5.57	7.57	N.S.	6.29	4.86	N.S.	5.29	6.79	N.S.
10. Counteraction	1.57	.93	N.S.	1.71	.71	2.39**	1.71	7.14	2.91***
11. Deference	2.86	2.29	N.S.	2.57	1.71	N.S.	2.71	3.43	N.S.
12. Description	4.43	3.64	N.S.	5.00	4.00	N.S.	5.57	5.79	N.S.
13. Dominance	5.00	2.43	2.21**	3.71	3.64	N.S.	5.43	3.93	N.S.
14. Identification	2.00	2.14	N.S.	2.14	2.79	N.S.	2.57	2.79	N.S.
15. Integrity	3.14	2.50	N.S.	3.14	1.50	2.02*	1.86	2.50	N.S.
16. Intellectualism	8.43	4.64	2.37**	7.57	4.64	2.35**	7.86	5.07	2.00*
17. Irritability	3.29	2.57	N.S.	2.43	2.86	N.S.	2.86	2.50	N.S.
18. Narcissism	.43	.43	N.S.	0	.50	N.S.	.57	.64	N.S.
19. Nurturance	13.14	12.50	N.S.	12.57	11.71	N.S.	11.42	10.07	N.S.

TABLE 359

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE MINNOWBROOK GROUP ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1] (CONT)

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
20. Omission	4.71	11.07	N.S.	3.00	7.57	N.S.	2.86	2.36	N.S.
21. Optimism	1.57	1.86	N.S.	1.71	2.29	N.S.	8.57	1.07	N.S.
22. Order	1.14	1.50	N.S.	1.00	1.14	N.S.	1.57	1.79	N.S.
23. Pessimism	.57	.07	N.S.	.29	0	N.S.	.14	.36	N.S.
24. Phobia	2.86	1.86	N.S.	3.57	2.50	N.S.	2.29	2.43	N.S.
25. Play	2.86	2.64	N.S.	3.57	1.93	4.35***	4.57	1.93	1.95*
26. Refusal	3.00	2.64	N.S.	3.43	3.29	N.S.	2.14	3.14	N.S.
27. Rejection	7.14	9.21	N.S.	8.29	9.71	N.S.	6.00	9.71	2.45**
28. Seclusion	0	.57	1.95*	.71	.36	N.S.	.71	.43	N.S.
29. Sentience	9.57	13.50	N.S.	10.57	11.50	N.S.	8.29	13.21	2.15**
30. Sex	0	.29	N.S.	1.00	.57	N.S.	.43	.36	N.S.
31. Submissiveness	.43	.79	N.S.	.14	.50	N.S.	0	.57	1.78*
32. Succorance	3.86	3.21	N.S.	2.14	2.86	N.S.	2.43	4.93	1.90*
33. Supernaturalism	2.71	2.79	N.S.	1.86	2.07	N.S.	2.43	3.21	N.S.
34. Understanding	6.14	3.43	2.08*	4.57	5.50	N.S.	3.86	3.29	N.S.
35. Unhappiness	1.43	2.93	N.S.	1.29	2.64	N.S.	3.00	2.50	N.S.

N = 7,14
df = 19
***.01>2.861
**.05>2.093
*.10>1.734

[1] Unmatched *t* test

Immediately following the counseling sessions differences on the GSC category scores showed significant differences between the two Minnowbrook sub-groups on variables 25 - Play at the .01 level, on 8 - Avoidance, 10 - Counteraction and 16 - Intellectualism at the .05 level and 15 - Integrity at the .10 level.

These differences represent new areas of significance from the pre-counseling comparison except for category 16 - Intellectualism. Counseling seems to have had the immediate effect of creating change in two ways: the minimizing of variability between the sex groups in three areas while at the same time creating it at a critical level in four others. The areas indicating differences between the two groups illustrate a somewhat greater variation in achievement response areas, 8 - Avoidance and 10 - Counteraction, as well as in personal values and the play aspect. These differences in content pattern or frequency are not, however, strikingly divergent from the initial pattern on Test I.

On the t test comparison of the third set of GSC variable scores obtained 6-9 months after the conclusion of counseling differences were noted at the .01 level for 4 - Acquisition and 10 - Counteraction, at the .05 level for 27 - Rejection and 29 - Sentience, and at the .10 level for 8 - Avoidance, 16 - Intellectualism, 25 - Play, 31 - Submissiveness and 32 - Succorance.

Category 16 - Intellectualism represents the only variable for which significant differences between the two sex groups obtained at all three periods. Counseling evidently does not appreciably alter differences between the two groups in this area, although the level at which significance is reached diminishes at the post-counseling period. In three additional variables, significant differences that occur immediately after counseling are maintained over the period following counseling (8 - Avoidance, 10 - Counteraction, and 25 - Play). Significant variation from the second administration disappears at the third session in only one instance, 15 - Integrity. It should be noted that significance in this area is noted at only the .10 level on the Test II data. New variation appearing 6-9 months after termination of counseling clusters in topics related to personal interactions and the acquisition of pleasure and material possessions.

The counseling experience seems to have altered the pattern of need pattern variation between the male and female segments of the Minnowbrook group. For the most part these shifts remain relatively constant over a period of no counseling with the added effect of variation in additional related topics and a tendency for increased differentiation in the self-gratification area.

5. Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC): Direction Scores. (Table 360)

The comparison of the Minnowbrook mother and father GSC Direction scores yielded no differences at any of the three critical levels of significance for the first testing session. No extreme variation between the two sub-groups seems to exist at this point on the direction scores of the stem responses.

TABLE 360

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE MINNOWBROOK GROUP ON GSC DIRECTION SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	X Husb.	Y Wives	t	X Husb.	Y Wives	t	X Husb.	Y Wives	t
1. Positive	88.28	84.64	N.S.	91.14	85.07	2.24**	93.14	85.14	N.S.
2. Negative	51.42	50.14	N.S.	49.85	52.00	N.S.	49.57	55.50	N.S.
3. Neutral	9.29	14.57	N.S.	8.00	11.93	N.S.	7.71	8.21	N.S.

N = 7,14
df = 19
***.01>2.861
**.05>2.093
*.10>1.734

[1] Unmatched t test

Differences reaching significance at the .05 level were obtained on the 1 - Positive Direction category on the analysis of the response scores immediately following counseling. No differences at the .01 or .10 levels were found. It is possible that this significance is due to the effect of the counseling experience.

On the third comparison, no significant differences were present for any of the three direction scores.

The post-counseling period does not seem to have influenced a change in direction scores between the two sex sub-groups. It would rather seem to have afforded an opportunity for variation noted immediately after counseling to revert to its relative pre-counseling status.

Thus, counseling would seem to have negligible impact in the alteration of direction scores on the GSC need personality variables of the two sex sub-groups of the Minnowbrook population.

6. Stern Activities Index (SAI). (Table 361)

Initial statistical significance between the male and female Minnowbrook SAI scores was observed for variable 18 - Objectivity at the .01 level, for 1 - Sentience, 27 - Ego Achievement, 30 - Emotionality and 40 - Placidity at the .05 level, and 25 - Narcissism at the .10 level. These initial differences between the two sexes seem to predominate in areas relating to ego achievement and gratification and to passive responses.

TABLE 361

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE MINNOWBROOK GROUP ON SAI SCORES[1]

Need Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	X Husb.	Y Wives	t	X Husb.	Y Wives	t	X Husb.	Y Wives	t
1. Sentience	1.71	3.43	2.82**	2.00	3.93	2.22**	2.43	3.86	N.S.
2. Sex	2.29	3.21	N.S.	3.29	4.21	N.S.	2.86	3.57	N.S.
3. Change	6.57	6.14	N.S.	6.43	7.07	N.S.	7.00	6.64	N.S.
4. Play	3.86	4.64	N.S.	4.00	5.14	N.S.	5.29	5.50	N.S.
5. Energy	5.43	4.86	N.S.	6.14	5.00	N.S.	5.86	5.43	N.S.
6. Pragmatism	9.14	7.29	N.S.	8.00	7.57	N.S.	7.43	7.43	N.S.
7. Adaptiveness	4.71	4.14	N.S.	4.57	3.64	N.S.	3.71	3.71	N.S.
8. Abasement	3.29	4.14	N.S.	3.71	4.07	N.S.	4.00	3.71	N.S.
9. Deference	6.86	7.21	N.S.	7.00	7.43	N.S.	6.29	7.36	N.S.
10. Order	5.29	6.57	N.S.	5.14	6.21	N.S.	4.71	6.79	N.S.
11. Harmavoidance	8.43	7.93	N.S.	7.00	7.50	N.S.	5.86	8.00	2.22**
12. Understanding	4.43	5.36	N.S.	4.57	57.14	N.S.	4.43	5.29	N.S.
13. Counteraction	6.14	5.50	N.S.	7.00	5.14	1.93*	6.86	5.43	N.S.
14. Achievement	5.57	4.71	N.S.	5.71	4.86	N.S.	5.86	5.00	N.S.
15. Reflectiveness	5.00	5.57	N.S.	5.14	5.93	N.S.	5.71	6.14	N.S.
16. Humanism	6.71	5.86	N.S.	4.57	5.86	N.S.	3.71	6.00	2.04*
17. Scientism	4.57	3.43	N.S.	3.86	2.71	N.S.	4.29	3.43	N.S.
18. Objectivity	8.43	5.43	3.07***	7.00	5.57	N.S.	6.71	5.43	N.S.
19. Affiliation	8.14	7.79	N.S.	7.71	7.86	N.S.	7.00	7.50	N.S.
20. Nurturance	7.86	9.21	N.S.	8.29	8.71	N.S.	6.43	8.79	2.87***
21. Succorance	6.86	7.64	N.S.	8.29	8.00	N.S.	7.71	8.07	N.S.
22. Conjunctivity	7.14	6.00	N.S.	6.43	6.21	N.S.	5.29	5.71	N.S.
23. Aggression	2.43	1.50	N.S.	2.57	1.86	N.S.	3.00	1.79	1.76*
24. Dominance	3.86	4.64	N.S.	3.86	3.57	N.S.	4.57	3.86	N.S.
25. Narcissism	3.86	5.64	1.88*	4.29	3.57	N.S.	4.43	6.21	1.78*

TABLE 361
COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE MINNOWBROOK GROUP ON SAI SCORES[1]
(CONT)

Need Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
26. Fantasied Achievement	5.29	5.64	N.S.	5.00	5.43	N.S.	4.00	5.21	N.S.
27. Ego Achievement	2.57	4.71	2.62**	3.86	4.36	N.S.	4.43	4.57	N.S.
28. Exhibitionism	3.34	3.21	N.S.	4.00	32.14	N.S.	4.14	3.93	N.S.
29. Impulsion	3.86	4.21	N.S.	3.57	5.00	N.S.	4.71	5.50	N.S.
30. Emotionality	1.43	3.07	2.13**	2.29	39.29	1.91*	2.29	3.79	N.S.
31. Prudery	8.00	6.79	N.S.	6.71	5.79	N.S.	6.86	6.43	N.S.
32. Sameness	3.43	3.86	N.S.	3.57	2.93	N.S.	3.00	3.36	N.S.
33. Passivity	4.57	4.79	N.S.	3.86	5.00	N.S.	4.14	4.57	N.S.
34. Rejection	2.00	1.86	N.S.	1.43	1.71	N.S.	3.29	1.86	1.80*
35. Autonomy	3.14	2.36	N.S.	1.71	2.00	N.S.	2.29	1.93	N.S.
36. Disjunctivity	2.86	4.00	N.S.	3.57	3.79	N.S.	4.71	4.29	N.S.
37. Blameavoidance	7.71	8.50	N.S.	7.43	8.14	N.S.	7.00	8.21	N.S.
38. Infavoidance	5.21	5.64	N.S.	4.57	5.86	N.S.	4.57	5.29	N.S.
39. Deliberation	6.14	5.64	N.S.	6.43	5.00	N.S.	5.29	4.50	N.S.
40. Placidity	8.57	6.93	2.13**	7.71	3.07	3.42***	7.71	6.00	N.S.

N = 7,14
df = 19
***.01 > 2.861
**.05 > 2.093
*.10 > 1.734

[1] Unmatched *t* test

The relative amount of variation between the Minnowbrook male and female participants decreased somewhat on the post-counseling SAI. Significant differences at the .01 level were obtained only for 40 - Placidity. Differences reaching significance at the .05 level were obtained for variable 1 - Sentience. Significant trends at the .10 level were obtained for variables 13 - Counteraction and 30 - Emotionality.

It would seem that the week's counseling treatment does not have an immediate appreciable effect in the alteration of the pattern of formation and expression of need personality variables between the male and female Minnowbrook populations. A slight tendency is evident at this point for variation to be removed coincident with the counseling experience in three of the areas: 18 - Objectivity, 25 - Narcissism and 27 - Ego Achievement.

On the third test administration, variation between the two sexes on SAI variables increased slightly over Test II to the approximate level noted for Administration I. Differences reaching significance at the .01 level were found for variable 20 - Nurturance, at the .05 level for 11 - Harmavoidance, and at the .10 level for 16 - Humanism, 23 - Aggression, 25 - Narcissism and 34 - Rejection.

This patterning exists in somewhat different categories than was noted for the initial or the post-counseling comparison. In only one instance, 25 - Narcissism, does a significant variable at the pre-counseling period also appear as significant on Test III. None of the significant categories on Test II maintain their variation over the 6-9 months period. The major emphasis of the significance shown on Test III centers around ego preservation and interaction patterns.

It would appear from these findings that counseling and a post-counseling period have a slight influence upon alteration of the frequency of variation between males and females of the Minnowbrook clinic group on SAI variables. A greater change in the specific areas displaying inter-sex variation appears after the post-counseling period rather than immediately following the counseling.

The Minnowbrook group shows a somewhat greater variation between the two component sex groups on all instruments than do the more concentrated Cazenovia population. The Minnowbrook group also displays a tendency to be more deviant on Test II scores(except the GSC) in contrast to the Test I or Test III periods. This pattern is not evident for the Cazenovia group. Possibly the somewhat longer (1 week) counseling period creates a more noticeable immediate effect on the inter-sex variation. Whether this pattern maintains, decreases, or increases seems dependent upon the characteristics of the variables measured by the various instruments. On both the AMR and the SAI, decreased variation on Test II is followed by a resumption of the frequency pattern on Test III, though in somewhat different specific category locations in both instances. It is possible that the personality dynamics and need variables tapped by the AMR are dynamically related for each sex group so that a similar pattern is elicited. The reverse trend is noted for the PARI items. An increase in variation on Test II is followed by a decline on Test III. Perhaps, after the immediate effect of the counseling experience has been diminished, both sex groups tended to realign themselves in their former positions on these more generally experienced topic areas.

C. Twice a Month Group

1. Discomfort Relief Quotient (DRQ). (Table 362)

On the t test comparison of the DRQ scores for the male and female subjects of the Twice a Month clinic group significance was obtained in only one category, 5 - Parental Relationships, at the .10 level. No differences at the .01 or .05 levels occurred. This indicates a minor initial index of trend variation on this content area as it was obtained from the interview data.

TABLE 362

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE TWICE A MONTH GROUP ON IRQ SCORES[1]

Categories	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
1. Intra-Family	48.50	48.85	N.S.
2. Neighborhood	56.50	55.71	N.S.
3. Activity-Goals	58.25	65.14	N.S.
4. Community	46.00	65.85	N.S.
5. Parental Relationships	32.75	51.28	2.04*

N = 4,7
df = 9
***.01> 3.250
**.05> 2.262
*.10> 1.833

[1] Unmatched t test

2. Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI). (Table 363)

Significant variation between the two sexes initially occurred in only two instances between the male and female members of the Twice a Month clinic population: category 17 - Expression of Affection at the .01 level, and 7 - Irritability at the .05 level. No differences at the .10 level were obtained.

TABLE 363

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE TWICE A MONTH GROUP ON PARI SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
1. Encouraging Verbalization	18.00	10.14	N.S.	17.50	19.42	N.S.	17.25	19.04	N.S.
2. Fostering Dependency	9.24	5.14	N.S.	9.50	8.14	N.S.	11.00	8.57	N.S.
3. Seclusiveness	8.50	4.71	N.S.	8.75	10.71	2.10*	9.75	9.42	N.S.
4. Breaking the Will	10.50	5.85	N.S.	10.00	10.43	N.S.	9.50	9.28	N.S.
5. Marital Conflict	13.25	15.28	N.S.	14.50	15.00	N.S.	13.75	14.28	N.S.
6. Strictness	12.50	13.43	N.S.	12.75	13.71	N.S.	12.50	12.86	N.S.
7. Irritability	9.50	16.57	2.96**	9.50	15.42	2.97**	8.75	15.85	4.25***
8. Excluding Outside Influences	9.50	10.14	N.S.	9.25	10.29	N.S.	9.00	10.57	N.S.
9. Deification of Parent	9.75	12.42	N.S.	11.25	11.57	N.S.	11.00	11.57	N.S.
10. Suppression of Aggression	9.25	11.14	N.S.	10.25	9.42	N.S.	10.00	10.42	N.S.
11. Equalitarianism	17.00	16.85	N.S.	17.25	16.85	N.S.	18.00	17.85	N.S.
12. Avoidance of Communication	8.74	9.28	N.S.	10.00	10.57	N.S.	10.25	10.71	N.S.
13. Inconsid'ness	11.25	11.71	N.S.	11.75	11.28	N.S.	11.75	13.00	N.S.
14. Suppression of Sexuality	8.00	8.29	N.S.	8.50	8.28	N.S.	7.25	8.43	N.S.
15. Ascendancy	11.00	10.14	N.S.	12.75	11.85	N.S.	12.25	10.71	N.S.
16. Comradeship and Sharing	17.50	18.85	N.S.	18.50	19.14	N.S.	19.00	18.42	N.S.

TABLE 363

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE TWICE A MONTH GROUP ON PARI SCORES[1]
(CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
17. Expression of Affection	14.50	19.71	5.08***	14.50	19.57	5.57***	16.75	19.85	N.S.
18. Autonomy of Child	15.75	19.28	N.S.	18.25	19.42	N.S.	17.75	18.85	3.24**
19. Achievement	19.75	22.28	N.S.	22.25	23.14	N.S.	22.50	24.71	N.S.

N = 4,7
df = 9
***.01> 3.250
**.05> 2.262
*.10> 1.833

[1] Unmatched t test

For the first post-counseling administration, significant variation continued in the two categories at the same degree of criticalness: 17 - Expression of Affection at the .01 level, and 7 - Irritability at the .05 level of significance. Thus, some change in scores on the PARI occurs as an immediate effect of the counseling sessions held every two weeks over a three month period.

On the third administration, significance between the two groups on category 7 - Irritability was still evident but at the more critical .01 level, and significant differences appeared for category 18 - Autonomy of the Child at the .05 level. No differences at the .10 level appeared. The variation previously noted for 17 - Expression of Affection had decreased.

The frequency of variation between the two sex groups on PARI scores is not appreciably affected by the post-counseling period. The content areas reflecting variation do not differ basically over the three periods.

Minor variation between the mother and father segments of the Twice a Month group is detected initially, immediately after the completion of six counseling sessions, and after a post-counseling period on PARI scores. Hence, both the immediate and the delayed impact of the counseling session is minor in influencing either the frequency or pattern of variation on PARI scores for this clinic group.

3. Attitude Scale Toward Mental Retardation (AMR). (Table 364)

On the pre-counseling administration of the AMR, no significant differences were found at any of the three criterion levels between the male and female segments of the Twice a Month clinic group.

TABLE 364

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE TWICE A MONTH GROUP ON AMR SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	X Husb.	Y Wives	t	X Husb.	Y Wives	t	X Husb.	Y Wives	t
1. Sexuality	11.00	10.14	N.S.	9.50	10.14	N.S.	9.75	10.43	N.S.
2. Genetic Responsibility	4.25	5.43	N.S.	4.50	4.43	N.S.	4.25	5.43	N.S.
3. Appearance	5.25	5.57	N.S.	4.50	5.43	N.S.	6.00	5.71	N.S.
4. Normalcy of Development	33.50	27.85	N.S.	33.75	32.71	N.S.	35.50	33.85	N.S.
5. Dependency	22.50	25.28	N.S.	22.50	27.14	N.S.	24.00	26.14	N.S.
6. Independency	26.50	26.00	N.S.	25.75	23.85	N.S.	26.50	24.42	N.S.
7. Aggression	17.25	15.57	N.S.	14.50	16.28	N.S.	15.50	16.42	N.S.
8. Guilt	22.00	20.71	N.S.	20.50	21.71	N.S.	21.00	22.42	N.S.
9. Peer Interaction	27.75	29.42	N.S.	25.75	28.28	N.S.	28.25	28.28	N.S.

TABLE 364

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE TWICE A MONTH GROUP ON AMR SCORES[1] (CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
10. Concept of Retardation	27.25	32.28	N.S.	28.25	31.85	N.S.	28.75	34.42	N.S.
11. Abasement	26.50	27.85	N.S.	26.75	28.42	N.S.	27.50	30.28	N.S.
12. Comprehension of Self/Others	14.50	18.28	N.S.	15.75	16.71	N.S.	16.00	19.00	N.S.
13. Counteraction	24.75	23.57	N.S.	26.25	21.71	N.S.	24.25	24.00	N.S.
14. Educational Implications and Training	20.75	23.71	N.S.	23.75	24.42	N.S.	25.00	23.28	N.S.
15. Community Provision	17.00	17.85	N.S.	16.25	17.14	N.S.	18.50	17.42	N.S.
16. Emotional-Social Behavior	26.75	28.57	N.S.	25.00	28.28	N.S.	24.50	29.14	1.99*
17. Expression of Affection	16.00	18.85	N.S.	18.50	19.14	N.S.	19.50	19.57	N.S.
18. Suppression of Sex	7.50	10.29	N.S.	8.50	9.29	N.S.	8.50	9.14	N.S.
19. Encouraging Verbalization	18.25	18.42	N.S.	17.50	18.57	N.S.	17.25	18.71	N.S.
20. Excluding Outside Influences	9.50	10.71	N.S.	10.00	11.00	N.S.	8.50	11.14	N.S.
21. Avoidance of Communication	8.75	10.00	8.75	9.71	N.S.	9.00	10.71	N.S.	
22. Suppression of Aggression	9.75	10.14	N.S.	10.75	11.29	N.S.	11.00	10.86	N.S.
23. Deification	11.50	12.29	N.S.	12.00	11.14	N.S.	13.00	11.14	N.S.

TABLE 364
COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE TWICE A MONTH GROUP ON AMR SCORES[1]
(CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	X Husb.	Y Wives	t	X Husb.	Y Wives	t	X Husb.	Y Wives	t
24. Comradeship and Sharing	18.25	18.00	N.S.	18.00	18.28	N.S.	18.75	18.71	N.S.
25. Strictness	12.00	12.71	N.S.	13.00	10.43	2.05*	13.00	12.29	N.S.
26. Breaking the Will	9.00	9.85	N.S.	9.25	9.57	N.S.	10.00	8.43	N.S.
27. Irritability	11.25	15.28	N.S.	12.00	15.14	N.S.	15.00	17.85	N.S.
28. Autonomy of Child	17.00	18.71	N.S.	17.00	18.42	N.S.	17.50	18.00	N.S.
29. Equalitarianism	16.25	16.85	N.S.	16.25	15.28	N.S.	16.00	16.71	N.S.
30. Approval of Activity	13.25	12.00	N.S.	14.25	12.00	N.S.	13.25	12.57	N.S.
31. Fostering Dependency	11.25	10.00	N.S.	12.75	11.57	N.S.	11.25	11.14	N.S.
32. Acceleration of Development	12.00	9.86	N.S.	11.25	11.14	N.S.	12.25	10.71	N.S.
33. Achievement	21.25	19.85	N.S.	19.25	20.85	N.S.	23.25	22.14	N.S.

N = 4,7
df = 9
***.01> 3.250
**.05> 2.262
*.10> 1.833

[1] Unmatched *t* test

One difference at the .10 level was found at the post-counseling period for category 25 - Strictness. No further differences at the .01 or .05 levels appeared. Counseling seems to have had no appreciable immediate effect upon the frequency or pattern of variation between the male and female participants in this group.

On the third test administration, one category, 16 - Emotional-Social Behavior signified differences between the two sexes at the .10 level. No further differences at the .01 or .05 levels occurred. The post-counseling period then does not seem to have affected the frequency or pattern of variation on the inter-sex t test comparison for the Twice a Month clinic group on attitudes specifically relating to aspects of the condition of retardation.

Thus, the overall picture on the AMR sex comparison for the Twice a Month group indicates no initial variation and no noticeable change with the distributed counseling treatment or the post-counseling period.

4. Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC): Variable Scores. (Table 365)

The initial comparison of the Twice a Month mother and father GSC variable scores yielded significant variation at the .01 level for two categories: 12 - Description and 33 - Supernaturalism. No additional variation was obtained at the .05 or the .10 levels.

TABLE 365

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE TWICE A MONTH GROUP ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1]

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	X Husb.	Y Wives	t	X Husb.	Y Wives	t	X Husb.	Y Wives	t
1. Abasement	1.00	2.00	N.S.	1.00	1.00	N.S.	1.00	1.57	N.S.
2. Achievement	18.25	18.42	N.S.	26.75	22.28	N.S.	17.50	18.57	N.S.
3. Acquiescence	12.00	12.57	N.S.	11.50	9.14	N.S.	13.50	11.29	N.S.
4. Acquisition	3.00	2.14	N.S.	1.25	1.86	N.S.	1.25	2.00	N.S.
5. Affiliation	15.50	16.71	N.S.	9.50	15.71	N.S.	16.25	12.71	N.S.
6. Aggression	3.00	4.71	N.S.	4.25	4.29	N.S.	2.75	5.29	N.S.
7. Autonomy	1.00	1.43	N.S.	2.25	2.29	N.S.	1.25	2.71	N.S.
8. Avoidance	1.75	.86	N.S.	1.25	1.43	N.S.	1.25	2.14	N.S.

TABLE 365
COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE TWICE A MONTH GROUP ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1]
(CONT)

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
9. Benignness	3.50	3.57	N.S.	3.00	3.14	N.S.	4.50	3.29	N.S.
10. Counteraction	1.00	.43	N.S.	1.50	.43	1.94*	1.75	.43	N.S.
11. Deference	1.50	2.43	N.S.	2.50	3.71	N.S.	3.00	3.14	N.S.
12. Description	8.75	2.57	4.00***	7.50	3.57	2.69**	4.50	5.14	N.S.
13. Dominance	5.50	6.43	N.S.	3.75	4.57	N.S.	3.25	3.86	N.S.
14. Identification	1.50	1.14	N.S.	3.75	2.57	N.S.	.75	2.43	N.S.
15. Integrity	1.75	1.71	N.S.	1.25	3.14	N.S.	2.50	2.14	N.S.
16. Intellectualism	7.25	8.29	N.S.	8.25	8.57	N.S.	7.50	7.43	N.S.
17. Irritability	3.50	4.57	N.S.	4.50	3.71	N.S.	3.00	4.29	N.S.
18. Narcissism	0	.29	N.S.	0	.86	N.S.	0	1.71	N.S.
19. Nurturance	6.75	7.29	N.S.	6.50	9.86	N.S.	10.25	8.57	N.S.
20. Omission	8.50	4.57	N.S.	1.50	1.86	N.S.	4.00	2.29	N.S.
21. Optimism	1.50	1.14	N.S.	2.25	1.14	N.S.	2.75	.86	2.16*
22. Order	3.25	2.14	N.S.	2.75	2.71	N.S.	2.00	4.43	4.75***
23. Pessimism	0	.43	N.S.	0	.28	N.S.	0	.71	N.S.
24. Phobia	1.75	2.43	N.S.	2.25	2.29	N.S.	1.50	2.71	N.S.
25. Play	4.25	3.00	N.S.	5.25	4.86	N.S.	2.00	2.29	N.S.
26. Refusal	1.50	1.43	N.S.	4.25	1.43	2.57**	5.25	1.14	2.04*
27. Rejection	8.00	8.29	N.S.	9.75	9.00	N.S.	8.25	8.43	N.S.
28. Seclusion	0	.71	N.S.	.50	1.43	N.S.	.50	.43	N.S.
29. Sentience	12.00	10.28	N.S.	10.00	9.57	N.S.	12.50	5.86	1.92*
30. Sex	0	0	N.S.	0	.29	N.S.	0	.14	N.S.

TABLE 365
COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE
TWICE A MONTH GROUP ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1]
(CONT)

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
31. Submissiveness	.25	.71	N.S.	0	0	N.S.	0	1.00	N.S.
32. Succorance	2.50	3.00	N.S.	4.00	2.57	N.S.	3.25	4.71	N.S.
33. Supernaturalism	1.00	4.14	3.28***	.50	2.71	2.98**	2.00	1.86	N.S.
34. Understanding	5.25	5.43	N.S.	3.25	6.14	2.25*	6.00	5.14	N.S.
35. Unhappiness	2.00	2.57	N.S.	2.75	2.57	N.S.	3.25	2.57	N.S.

N = 4,7
df = 9
***.01>3.250
**.05>2.262
*.10>1.833

[1] Unmatched t test

Both these category variables represent non-personalized aspects of personality expression. The scores of the fathers indicate the greatest frequency of the 12 - Description response. In some contexts this response could be clinically interpreted as an avoidance reaction. Its considerably higher occurrence in the male population might also be attributable to the more concrete, direct manner in which a greater proportion of the men are accustomed to responding during the course of their daily work experiences in contrast to the generally more subjective approach of a housewife - mother.

On the first post-counseling administration, differences reaching significance at the .05 level were attained for variables 12 - Description, 26 - Refusal and 33 - Supernaturalism. Differences at the .10 level were found in 10 - Counteraction and 34 - Understanding. No significant differences at the .01 level were obtained.

Both of the variables showing initial significant variation between the husbands and wives (12 - Description and 33 - Supernaturalism) maintain variation though at a less critical level of significance, after the completion of the six counseling sessions. Two of the new variables, 26 - Refusal and 34 - Understanding, essentially continue the pattern for significance in the more non-personalized reaction areas. Variable 26 - Refusal has a higher raw score for the males, thus indicating further evidence of a greater reluctance to complete a response to an emotionally laden stem.

Counseling would seem to have brought about some change in the relationship between the male and female members of the Twice a Month group on GSC scores. No striking change in content areas reflecting differences is noted. Rather a maintenance and addition to the pattern already existent prior to the counseling experience is observed.

After the period following termination of the counseling sessions, the t test comparison of the mother and father GSC variable scores yielded significant differences at the .01 level for variable 22 - Order, and at the .10 level for 21 - Optimism, 26 - Refusal and 29 - Sentience. No differences at the .05 level were obtained.

These results reflect a somewhat greater change in manifest personality need pattern than was noted immediately after counseling. In only one instance, 26 - Refusal, significant differences exist on either Test I or II and are carried over at a later level. This again seems to be due to a much higher score for the males. The personality dynamics inherent in the other three variables which show significant variability are much more personally oriented than those previously observed.

It would seem from a perusal of these results that the distributed counseling experience for the Twice a Month clinic population has definite influence upon the variation between male and female scores on the need personality variables measured by the GSC. Immediately following the end of the three months counseling period the change seems essentially a quantitative one, whereas over the long interim period a qualitative change seems to have taken place.

5. Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC): Direction Scores. (Table 366)

On the analysis of the GSC Direction scores between the husband and wife subjects, no statistical significance at the .01, .05 or the .10 levels was obtained for any of the three testing periods. Thus no significant initial variation between the two sub-groups seems to exist. Further the counseling experiences provided do not significantly affect the frequency or pattern of direction responses either immediately or after a lapse of time.

TABLE 366
COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE
TWICE A MONTH GROUP ON GSC . DIRECTION SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
1. Positive	83.75	84.00	N.S.	84.25	82.85	N.S.	86.25	82.14	N.S.
2. Negative	49.00	58.42	N.S.	56.75	60.42	N.S.	54.00	59.71	N.S.
3. Neutral	16.25	6.57	N.S.	8.00	5.71	N.S.	8.75	7.14	N.S.

N = 4,7
df = 9
***.01>3.250
**.05>2.262
*.10>1.833

[1] Unmatched *t* test

6. Stern Activities Index (SAI). (Table 367)

Initial significant variation between the male and female Twice a Month clinic subjects on SAI scores occurred in ten variables: 30 - Emotionality and 40 - Placidity at the .01 level; 5 - Energy, 11 - Harmavoidance, 12 - Understanding, 13 - Counteraction, 14 - Achievement and 35 - Autonomy at the .05 level; and 17 - Scientism and 18 - Objectivity at the .10 level. A variety of generalized need areas which include intellectual and achievement topics, self-maintenance, and emotionalized activity seem to predominate.

TABLE 367
COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE TWICE A MONTH GROUP ON SAI SCORES[1]

Need Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
1. Sentience	3.50	3.86	N.S.	3.75	2.00	1.94*	3.25	2.57	N.S.
2. Sex	4.75	3.71	N.S.	3.75	3.57	N.S.	2.25	2.29	N.S.
3. Change	5.75	5.86	N.S.	7.00	5.86	N.S.	6.00	6.43	N.S.
4. Play	4.75	5.57	N.S.	3.50	5.43	N.S.	2.50	5.57	5.64***
5. Energy	8.25	5.43	2.63**	7.25	5.00	2.01*	7.00	6.14	N.S.
6. Pragmatism	8.00	6.71	N.S.	8.00	7.43	N.S.	7.75	7.43	N.S.
7. Adaptiveness	3.00	3.86	N.S.	2.50	2.43	N.S.	3.75	2.57	N.S.
8. Abasement	3.50	3.57	N.S.	2.75	3.43	N.S.	3.75	4.00	N.S.
9. Deference	6.50	7.00	N.S.	7.25	7.14	N.S.	7.00	6.57	N.S.
10. Order	6.75	7.86	N.S.	6.75	7.14	N.S.	7.25	7.14	N.S.
11. Harmavoidance	5.50	8.43	2.96**	5.75	8.29	2.53**	4.50	8.86	4.30***
12. Understanding	8.25	5.00	3.02**	8.25	5.00	2.81**	8.00	5.43	2.93**
13. Counteraction	8.00	4.86	2.36**	5.50	4.43	N.S.	8.00	4.86	3.16**
14. Achievement	7.75	3.57	2.87**	7.50	3.71	N.S.	6.75	4.29	2.08*
15. Reflectiveness	6.50	7.71	N.S.	6.50	6.57	N.S.	6.50	6.57	N.S.
16. Humanism	6.75	4.57	N.S.	5.75	4.71	N.S.	5.25	4.71	N.S.

TABLE 367
COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE TWICE A MONTH GROUP ON SAI SCORES[1]
(CONT)

Need Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
17. Scientism	9.25	4.00	2.01*	9.00	2.57	9.85***	9.50	2.14	10.21***
18. Objectivity	6.00	8.00	1.96*	5.75	7.57	N.S.	6.00	7.71	N.S.
19. Affiliation	4.75	5.86	N.S.	3.75	5.29	N.S.	3.50	5.71	N.S.
20. Nurturance	8.25	7.86	N.S.	6.00	7.43	N.S.	6.00	7.43	N.S.
21. Succorance	6.00	7.57	N.S.	4.75	7.29	N.S.	4.50	6.43	N.S.
22. Conjunctivity	7.00	5.43	N.S.	6.75	6.14	N.S.	6.50	5.43	N.S.
23. Aggression	2.75	2.86	N.S.	1.25	3.29	3.75***	.75	3.00	4.24***
24. Dominance	4.00	2.86	N.S.	3.25	3.43	N.S.	2.50	3.43	N.S.
25. Narcissism	7.00	5.71	N.S.	7.00	6.29	N.S.	6.75	5.57	N.S.
26. Fantasied Achievement	7.25	5.29	N.S.	7.25	5.00	N.S.	7.50	5.86	N.S.
27. Ego Achievement	3.50	4.71	N.S.	3.50	5.57	N.S.	2.50	5.00	N.S.
28. Exhibitionism	3.25	3.29	N.S.	3.50	3.57	N.S.	3.00	2.71	N.S.
29. Impulsion	3.25	5.00	N.S.	3.25	6.14	13.83**	3.00	4.86	N.S.
30. Emotionality	1.75	4.43	3.65***	1.00	4.57	3.36***	1.50	4.57	3.39***
31. Prudery	5.25	6.29	N.S.	6.25	6.43	N.S.	7.75	7.71	N.S.
32. Sameness	4.25	4.00	N.S.	3.00	4.14	N.S.	4.00	3.57	N.S.
33. Passivity	4.25	4.57	N.S.	2.75	5.00	2.01*	3.00	3.86	N.S.
34. Rejection	3.50	3.14	N.S.	5.00	3.71	N.S.	5.25	3.43	N.S.
35. Autonomy	5.50	2.43	2.43**	5.25	2.71	N.S.	5.50	3.57	N.S.
36. Disjunctivity	3.00	4.57	N.S.	3.25	3.86	N.S.	3.50	4.57	N.S.

TABLE 367
COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE
TWICE A MONTH GROUP ON SAI SCORES[1]
(CONT)

Need Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
37. Blameavoidance	7.25	7.00	N.S.	8.75	6.71	N.S.	9.25	7.00	N.S.
38. Infavoidance	4.50	6.00	N.S.	5.50	6.00	N.S.	4.75	6.29	N.S.
39. Deliberation	6.75	5.00	N.S.	6.75	4.71	N.S.	7.00	5.14	N.S.
40. Placidity	8.25	5.57	3.61***	9.00	5.43	3.37***	8.50	6.00	1.97*

N = 4, 7
df = 9
***.01 > 3.250
**.05 > 2.262
*.10 > 1.833

[1] Unmatched *t* test

On Test II the data indicated significant differences for ten of the forty variables: 17 - Scientism, 23 - Aggression, 29 - Impulsion, 30 - Emotionality, and 40 - Placidity at the .01 level; 11 - Harmavoidance and 12 - Understanding at the .05 level; and 1 - Sentience, 5 - Energy and 33 - Passivity at the .10 level.

Five of these represent a maintenance of significant variation from the pre-counseling scores. New variation is primarily related to more personalized aspects. In the same vein, those areas maintaining significant variation between husbands and wives after counseling tend to also be more basically personally directed than those in which variability disappears. Thus, while counseling does not appreciably increase the frequency of variation between the mothers and fathers on the need personality variables measured by the SAI, a qualitative change toward a more subjective emphasis is noted. It should also be pointed out that a greater frequency of variation at the more critical .01 level is noted after counseling so that the intensity of feeling has been altered.

The comparison of the third set of SAI scores yielded significance in nine variables: 4 - Play, 11 - Harmavoidance, 17 - Scientism, 23 - Aggression and 30 - Emotionality at the .01 level; 12 - Understanding and 13 - Counteraction at the .05 level; and 14 - Achievement and 40 - Placidity at the .10 level.

For five of these variables, statistically significant differences have been obtained at all three test periods: 11 - Harmavoidance, 12 - Understanding 17 - Scientism, 30 - Emotionality, and 40 - Placidity. This suggests that initial sex differences existing on the SAI items comprising these categories were not appreciably altered either by the counseling sessions or the period following counseling. These categories represent a rather divergent selection of variables so that no one factor would account for either the initial sex variation or the maintenance of these patterns. Two of the other significant variables, 13 - Counteraction and 14 - Achievement, show significance on the pre-test and seem to have returned to the former pattern of adjustment after exhibiting no unusual variation immediately following counseling. Counseling seems to have created and sustained variation for 23 - Aggression. The only instance where new inter-sex variability originates on Test III data is for 4 - Play. Thus, the post-counseling period has a minimal effect in creating new patterns on the SAI need variables although it does seem to have served as a reinforcement for some, as a time for the reinstating of others observed prior to counseling, and as a factor in the diminution of variation created by counseling (1 - Sentience, 29 - Impulsion, 33 - Passivity), or existing through the counseling period (5 - Energy).

In considering the Twice a Month group male-female comparisons, a more even pattern is noted between instruments than was true for the two concentrated groups (Cazenovia and Minnowbrook). Negligible significant variation between the two sexes appears at any period for the general attitudes toward children and child-rearing practices as measured by the PARI, attitudes toward retardation as recorded by the AMR, and on GSC Direction scores. More pronounced differences occur after counseling on GSC need personality variables and much more frequent variation appears for the need variables measured by the SAI. Since the greatest real variation is present on these two more generalized scales, it seems that the Twice a Month male and female subjects differ most strikingly in these personality areas and that they are more homogeneous on the specific scales relating to child-rearing and retardation at all stages. The lesser comparative effect of counseling upon the patterns measured by any of the scales is also a departure from the general pattern noted for the other two clinic groups already discussed.

D. Once a Month Group

1. Discomfort Relief Quotient (DRQ)(Table 368)

On the t test comparison of the mothers and fathers in the Once a Month group on DRQ scores, significant variation at the .05 level was obtained for category 3 - Activity-Goals and at the .10 level in 2 - Neighborhood and 4 - Community. No significant differences were noted for the .01 level.

TABLE 368

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE ONCE A MONTH GROUP ON IRQ SCORES[1]

Categories	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
1. Intra-Family	40.25	54.50	N.S.
2. Neighborhood	26.75	58.75	2.13*
3. Activity-Goals	28.75	60.50	2.72**
4. Community	54.25	76.75	2.04*
5. Parental Relationships	16.75	40.00	N.S.

N = 4,4
df = 6
***.01 > 3.707
**.05 > 2.447
*.10 > 1.943

[1] Unmatched t test

The frequency of variation in three of five categories is noteworthy, especially in contrast to the pattern observed for the preceding concentrated groups. The differences occur in the generally less personally related category areas.

2. Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI), Table 369

The only occurrence of significant differences between the Once a Month husbands and wives on the PARI appeared in category 7 - Irritability at the .10 level. Additional differences at the .01 or .05 levels were not detected. This represents a trend between the two sub-groups prior to the counseling treatment on the 19 comparable PARI categories and it appears in a content area closely related to the personality adjustment of the parent.

TABLE 369

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE ONCE A MONTH GROUP ON PARI SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	X Husb.	Y Wives	t	X Husb.	Y Wives	t	X Husb.	Y Wives	t
1. Encouraging Verbalization	13.00	11.75	N.S.	15.00	18.00	N.S.	15.50	19.75	6.14***
2. Fostering Dependency	11.75	11.00	N.S.	11.50	9.50	N.S.	12.00	11.50	N.S.
3. Seclusiveness	9.50	11.75	N.S.	9.75	11.50	N.S.	10.00	13.00	N.S.
4. Breaking the Will	12.50	11.25	N.S.	12.00	10.25	N.S.	11.50	10.25	N.S.
5. Marital Conflict	14.50	11.75	N.S.	15.75	15.75	N.S.	16.50	15.75	N.S.
6. Strictness	12.50	13.00	N.S.	14.75	15.25	N.S.	16.00	15.50	N.S.
7. Irritability	14.50	11.00	1.99*	13.50	14.00	N.S.	12.50	13.75	N.S.
8. Excluding Outside Influences	10.75	10.00	N.S.	11.25	10.25	N.S.	12.25	12.00	N.S.
9. Deification of Parent	12.25	11.00	N.S.	14.00	12.00	N.S.	14.25	14.75	N.S.
10. Suppression of Aggression	10.25	13.00	N.S.	8.75	11.50	3.42**	9.50	12.50	N.S.
11. Equalitarianism	13.75	11.75	N.S.	15.75	15.75	N.S.	17.50	15.75	N.S.
12. Avoidance of Communication	11.50	11.75	N.S.	10.25	8.75	N.S.	10.50	8.50	N.S.
13. Inconsid'ness	13.25	12.50	N.S.	13.50	13.25	N.S.	15.25	15.00	N.S.
14. Suppression of Sexuality	10.75	9.75	N.S.	9.25	8.50	N.S.	9.75	7.50	N.S.
15. Ascendancy	13.75	10.75	N.S.	13.00	12.00	N.S.	12.75	13.50	N.S.
16. Comradeship	15.00	12.25	N.S.	16.50	18.75	N.S.	17.00	19.75	N.S.

TABLE 369

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE
ONCE A MONTH GROUP ON PARI SCORES[1]
(CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
. Expression of Affection	12.75	12.25	N.S.	16.25	19.25	3.06**	15.75	19.75	2.55**
. Autonomy of the Child	14.25	14.00	N.S.	15.75	18.75	3.79***	18.25	19.50	N.S.
. Achievement	20.75	17.25	N.S.	24.75	22.50	N.S.	25.50	23.50	N.S.

= 4,4
= 6
*.01 3.707
*.05 2.447
*.10 1.943

nmatched t test

On the post-counseling battery, significant inter-sex differences were obtained for three categories: 18 - Autonomy of the Child at the .01 level; and 10 - Suppression of Aggression and 17 - Expression of Affection at the .05 level. No differences at the .10 level were detected.

An increase both in frequency and intensity of variation on these items seems to have been brought about by the Once a Month counseling experience. In addition, all three categories are very directly related to child-rearing practices. The minimal variation noted for 7 - Irritability initially seems to have dissipated over the counseling period.

Following the period of no counseling, significant variation occurred in two instances: category 1 - Encouraging Verbalization at the .01 level; and 17 - Expression of Affection at the .05 level. No additional indications of divergence were obtained at the .10 level.

Variation seemingly created by the counseling experience decreases in two categories with a continuation only in 17 - Expression of Affection. However, critical variation appears in category 1 - Encouraging Verbalization, a topic quite closely related to the emphasis on child-rearing behavior previously noted. The post-counseling period seems to have decreased inter-sex variation from Test II. It should be noted that differences at all levels are minimal so that comments on patterns or trends noted should be viewed with some caution.

3. Attitude Scale Toward Mental Retardation (AMR)(Table 370)

Initial differences between the Once a Month mother and father subjects on AMR scores fell within three categories: 32 - Acceleration of Development at the .05 level; and 5 - Dependency and 7 - Aggression at the .10 level of significance. No difference at the .01 level was obtained.

TABLE 370

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE ONCE A MONTH GROUP ON AMR SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
1. Sexuality	9.00	10.75	N.S.	9.50	11.00	N.S.	10.50	10.00	N.S.
2. Genetic Responsibility	4.00	4.75	N.S.	4.00	4.50	N.S.	4.00	4.50	N.S.
3. Appearance	4.50	5.50	N.S.	4.00	4.00	N.S.	4.25	5.25	N.S.
4. Normalcy of Development	35.00	39.00	N.S.	40.00	36.75	N.S.	37.00	36.00	N.S.
5. Dependency	20.75	26.75	2.00*	22.75	28.75	N.S.	22.75	25.00	N.S.
6. Independency	26.00	26.75	N.S.	26.25	26.25	N.S.	28.75	28.25	N.S.
7. Aggression	14.25	19.25	2.32*	13.25	16.50	N.S.	16.00	16.50	N.S.
8. Guilt	19.25	19.00	N.S.	18.00	19.00	N.S.	19.00	19.25	N.S.
9. Peer Interaction	22.50	25.25	N.S.	23.00	24.75	N.S.	22.75	25.50	N.S.

TABLE 370

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE ONCE A MONTH GROUP ON AMR SCORES[1] (CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
10. Concept of Retardation	30.75	33.50	N.S.	27.00	33.50	N.S.	31.50	35.00	N.S.
11. Abasement	23.50	27.75	N.S.	21.00	27.50	N.S.	22.75	28.25	N.S.
12. Comprehension of Self/Others	15.25	16.25	N.S.	15.00	15.75	N.S.	20.00	16.25	N.S.
13. Counteraction	24.25	23.00	N.S.	22.25	23.50	N.S.	24.50	25.50	N.S.
14. Educational Implications and Training	22.50	25.00	N.S.	23.25	22.75	N.S.	23.00	24.25	N.S.
15. Community Provision	15.50	16.25	N.S.	17.25	18.50	N.S.	16.75	17.75	N.S.
16. Emotional-Social Behavior	25.25	29.00	N.S.	22.25	27.00	1.96*	24.00	26.50	N.S.
17. Expression of Affection	19.25	18.50	N.S.	18.00	18.75	N.S.	18.25	18.75	N.S.
18. Suppression of Sex	8.50	9.25	N.S.	8.50	7.50	N.S.	8.00	6.75	N.S.
19. Encouraging Verbalization	18.25	16.00	N.S.	17.00	18.25	N.S.	17.75	19.50	N.S.
20. Excluding Outside Influences	11.25	11.75	N.S.	10.00	11.00	N.S.	12.00	10.75	N.S.
21. Avoidance of Communication	9.50	8.50	N.S.	9.75	6.25	N.S.	9.75	9.00	N.S.
22. Suppression of Aggression	9.75	11.50	N.S.	7.00	12.00	2.40*	10.50	12.00	N.S.
23. Deification	14.00	12.00	N.S.	12.50	13.75	N.S.	16.00	14.75	N.S.
24. Comradeship and Sharing	17.75	17.75	N.S.	18.25	18.75	N.S.	17.75	18.50	N.S.
25. Strictness	13.25	12.75	N.S.	13.25	13.50	N.S.	16.00	13.00	N.S.

TABLE 370

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE ONCE A MONTH GROUP ON AMR SCORES[1] (CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	X Husb.	Y Wives	t	X Husb.	Y Wives	t	X Husb.	Y Wives	t
26. Breaking the Will	9.00	10.75	N.S.	8.75	10.75	N.S.	8.75	9.25	N.S.
27. Irritability	12.25	10.00	N.S.	10.50	12.75	N.S.	14.00	12.00	N.S.
28. Autonomy of Child	17.00	16.25	N.S.	17.50	17.75	N.S.	18.00	18.75	N.S.
29. Equalitarianism	17.25	15.75	N.S.	15.50	16.75	N.S.	16.50	16.75	N.S.
30. Approval of Activity	12.75	9.50	N.S.	13.50	10.25	1.99*	13.50	11.25	N.S.
31. Fostering Dependency	9.50	12.50	N.S.	11.00	13.25	N.S.	11.25	13.25	N.S.
32. Acceleration of Development	13.50	9.75	3.28**	14.25	9.75	3.36**	14.75	9.50	3.92***
33. Achievement	20.50	16.75	N.S.	21.75	19.00	N.S.	25.25	19.50	N.S.

N =4,4
df=6
***.01 > 3.707
**.05 > 2.447
*.10 > 1.943

[1] Unmatched *t* test

Male and female differences increased slightly after the 6 months counseling experience. Significance was obtained at the .05 level in category 32 - Acceleration of Development; and at the .10 level in 16 - Emotional-Social Behavior, 22 - Suppression of Aggression and 30 - Approval of Activity. No differences reaching significance at the .01 level were detected.

Variation carried over from the pre-counseling period appears only for 32 - Acceleration of Development. In the other instances, variation previously noted becomes non-significant and critical differences appear in different category areas. Topics concerned basically with handling of the retardate and with goals and achievement seem to elicit sex differences in this group immediately after counseling.

Significant differences decreased considerably by the third administration period. Category 32 - Acceleration of Development maintained variability at a more critical level (.01) than on Test I or II. No other significance was obtained at the .05 or .10 levels.

It seems that the post-counseling period tends to minimize specific variation appearing immediately after counseling while at the same time not precipitating the development of new differences or the reinstatement of earlier patterns. Consequently this period generally tends to increase inter-group homogeneity. As minimal differences are generally noted, conclusions from this comparison should be made cautiously. The pattern for the decrease of heterogeneity following counseling and the areas showing consistent and transitory differences are noteworthy in the total picture.

4. Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC); Variable Scores (Table 371)

[illegible] none of the 35 category variables yielded significant indications of heterogeneity between the two sexes at any of the three criterion levels of significance.

Immediately following the termination of counseling, differences were obtained for one variable, 22-Order, at the .10 level of significance. No differences at the .01 level or the .05 level were found. Counseling seems to have no immediate effect upon the alteration of sex patterns on personality need variables as determined by GSC Variable scores.

TABLE 371

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE ONCE A MONTH GROUP ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1]

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
1. Abasement	2.00	1.75	N.S.	2.75	2.25	N.S.	2.50	1.75	N.S.
2. Achievement	18.50	17.25	N.S.	18.25	15.50	N.S.	20.50	15.50	2.20*
3. Acquiescence	10.75	13.00	N.S.	14.75	14.00	N.S.	13.00	17.25	N.S.
4. Acquisition	3.00	1.75	N.S.	2.00	1.75	N.S.	1.75	1.25	N.S.
5. Affiliation	13.00	12.50	N.S.	11.75	15.50	N.S.	11.25	18.25	2.43*
6. Aggression	2.50	4.50	N.S.	2.00	3.25	N.S.	4.75	3.00	N.S.
7. Autonomy	1.50	1.25	N.S.	1.00	1.00	N.S.	1.00	.75	N.S.
8. Avoidance	1.00	1.00	N.S.	3.25	2.00	N.S.	1.50	1.50	N.S.
9. Benignness	8.75	3.50	N.S.	10.75	5.00	N.S.	11.50	5.25	N.S.
10. Counteraction	2.00	.75	N.S.	1.75	1.50	N.S.	2.50	1.75	N.S.
11. Deference	1.00	2.25	N.S.	2.75	1.75	N.S.	2.50	1.25	N.S.
12. Description	2.75	3.25	N.S.	3.75	4.75	N.S.	4.50	6.75	N.S.
13. Dominance	2.75	4.50	N.S.	3.25	3.50	N.S.	2.25	3.25	N.S.
14. Identification	3.00	1.00	N.S.	4.50	2.25	N.S.	5.00	2.75	N.S.
15. Integrity	2.25	1.75	N.S.	1.25	1.00	N.S.	.75	1.50	N.S.
16. Intellectualism	5.75	7.00	N.S.	5.50	7.25	N.S.	8.00	5.50	N.S.
17. Irritability	3.25	3.75	N.S.	4.25	3.50	N.S.	3.50	6.50	N.S.
19. Nurturance	12.00	11.50	N.S.	8.00	12.00	N.S.	9.75	10.75	N.S.
20. Omission	13.75	9.50	N.S.	5.25	5.00	N.S.	1.25	2.00	N.S.
21. Optimism	1.75	1.25	N.S.	2.25	1.75	N.S.	2.50	.75	N.S.
22. Order	1.75	2.00	N.S.	0	2.25	2.25*	0	1.50	N.S.
23. Pessimism	0	.50	N.S.	0	.25	N.S.	0	.25	N.S.
24. Phobia	2.00	3.50	N.S.	1.50	2.75	N.S.	2.25	2.00	N.S.
25. Play	1.50	2.25	N.S.	1.50	2.75	N.S.	2.25	3.25	N.S.

TABLE 371

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE ONCE A MONTH GROUP ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1]
(CONT)

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
26. Refusal	2.75	3.00	N.S.	2.50	2.50	N.S.	6.00	4.25	N.S.
27. Rejection	10.25	8.75	N.S.	12.00	10.00	N.S.	9.75	7.50	N.S.
28. Seclusion	.25	.75	N.S.	.50	.50	N.S.	.25	.75	N.S.
29. Sentience	10.50	9.50	N.S.	11.00	10.50	N.S.	12.00	9.50	N.S.
30. Sex	.50	.25	N.S.	.50	0	N.S.	.50	.50	N.S.
31. Submissiveness	.75	.25	N.S.	0	0	N.S.	0	0	N.S.
32. Succorance	2.75	3.50	N.S.	3.00	2.75	N.S.	1.75	2.50	N.S.
33. Supernaturalism	1.50	4.75	N.S.	3.00	4.25	N.S.	1.25	5.00	3.40**
34. Understanding	1.75	5.00	N.S.	2.50	4.25	N.S.	1.75	2.50	N.S.
35. Unhappiness	1.25	1.75	N.S.	1.50	2.50	N.S.	1.25	1.25	N.S.

N = 4,4
df = 6
***.01 > 3.707
**.05 > 2.447
*.10 > 1.943

[1] Unmatched t test

At the third test period, differences between husbands and wives were found in three categories: 33 - Supernaturalism at the .05 level; and 2 - Achievement and 5 - Affiliation at the .10 level. No differences exhibited significance at the .01 level.

It is possible that this increase in variation between the two sexes reflects an alteration due in part to the impact of the post-counseling period. The three categories which show variation do not seem to reflect any constant area of emphasis which can be identified for the focus of the differences. The overall pattern for the Once a Month comparison shows minimal heterogeneity at all points and thus a limited effect of the counseling experience upon change or pattern measured by the GSC Variables.

5. Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC): Direction Scores. Table 372

The GSC Direction scores showed no significant differences between the two sexes on the analysis of either the pre-counseling, the first post-counseling or the second post-counseling data. Thus, major differences between these two sub-groups do not initially exist. This pattern is not altered by counseling held once a month over a six-month period.

TABLE 372

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE ONCE A MONTH GROUP ON GSC DIRECTION SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	X Husb.	Y Wives	t	X Husb.	Y Wives	t	X Husb.	Y Wives	t
1. Positive	87.50	81.75	N.S.	91.25	81.50	N.S.	88.25	82.25	N.S.
2. Negative	46.00	53.50	N.S.	49.00	55.50	N.S.	55.00	56.75	N.S.
3. Neutral	15.50	13.75	N.S.	8.75	12.00	N.S.	5.75	10.00	N.S.

N = 4,4
df = 6
***.01 > 3.707
**.05 > 2.447
*.10 > 1.943

[1] Unmatched t test

6. Stern Activities Index (SAI). (Table 373)

The initial t test comparison of the sub-groups on SAI scores indicated significant differences on four of the need variables: 11 - Harmavoidance at the .01 level; 10 - Order and 19 - Affiliation at the .05 level; and 13 - Counteraction at the .10 level. These areas reflect sex differences in major topic areas concerned with self maintenance and achievement and the interpersonal aspect.

TABLE 373

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE ONCE A MONTH GROUP ON SAI SCORES[1]

Need Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
1. Sentience	3.50	3.00	N.S.	2.75	2.50	N.S.	2.50	3.75	N.S.
2. Sex	4.00	1.75	N.S.	3.00	2.25	N.S.	3.50	.75	N.S.
3. Change	5.50	7.00	N.S.	7.00	6.00	N.S.	7.75	5.25	N.S.
4. Play	5.50	4.00	N.S.	5.50	4.50	N.S.	5.00	5.00	N.S.
5. Energy	6.00	5.00	N.S.	5.00	4.75	N.S.	6.00	3.75	N.S.
6. Pragmatism	6.75	6.25	N.S.	7.25	7.50	N.S.	7.75	6.75	N.S.
7. Adaptiveness	2.75	2.75	N.S.	3.25	2.00	N.S.	3.75	3.50	N.S.
8. Abasement	2.75	2.75	N.S.	3.00	2.00	N.S.	3.25	3.50	N.S.
9. Deference	6.50	6.50	N.S.	5.75	7.50	N.S.	5.75	6.50	N.S.
10. Order	1.25	4.50	3.28**	2.00	6.50	4.70**	1.50	5.25	4.16***
11. Harmavoidance	4.50	8.00	3.84***	4.00	8.25	5.64**	3.25	8.75	6.64***
12. Understanding	5.00	3.50	N.S.	4.25	5.75	N.S.	4.75	5.00	N.S.
13. Counteraction	6.50	3.50	2.32*	7.00	4.00	2.45**	6.50	4.00	N.S.
14. Achievement	6.25	3.25	N.S.	5.75	3.00	N.S.	6.00	2.50	N.S.
15. Reflectiveness	4.25	3.25	N.S.	4.50	5.25	N.S.	3.25	5.75	N.S.
16. Humanism	5.00	4.75	N.S.	3.50	4.00	N.S.	2.75	4.50	N.S.
17. Scientism	4.50	2.25	N.S.	4.75	2.50	N.S.	3.75	2.50	N.S.
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
19. Affiliation	8.25	5.25	3.37**	8.00	4.50	4.58**	7.75	4.75	2.82**
20. Nurturance	7.00	6.50	N.S.	7.50	7.00	N.S.	7.50	7.00	N.S.
21. Succorance	7.00	6.25	N.S.	6.75	7.25	N.S.	6.75	7.50	N.S.
22. Conjunctivity	5.25	5.75	N.S.	5.00	4.50	N.S.	5.00	4.75	N.S.
23. Aggression	2.75	2.50	N.S.	4.25	2.00	N.S.	3.75	1.25	2.31*
24. Dominance	3.75	2.00	N.S.	4.50	4.00	N.S.	4.00	2.25	N.S.
25. Narcissism	5.00	4.75	N.S.	4.25	5.00	N.S.	4.50	5.50	N.S.

TABLE 373

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE ONCE A MONTH GROUP ON SAI SCORES[1] (CONT)

Need Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husb.	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
26. Fantasied Achievement	5.25	3.75	N.S.	5.25	4.75	N.S.	6.00	4.50	N.S.
27. Ego Achievement	4.50	3.00	N.S.	4.50	3.00	N.S.	5.25	4.25	N.S.
28. Exhibitionism	4.00	2.25	N.S.	3.75	3.00	N.S.	6.00	2.75	2.10*
29. Impulsion	5.00	3.75	N.S.	6.00	4.75	N.S.	5.75	3.50	2.08*
30. Emotionality	3.25	3.75	N.S.	3.25	2.75	N.S.	4.00	3.25	N.S.
31. Prudery	6.00	8.25	N.S.	7.00	7.75	N.S.	4.00	3.25	N.S.
32. Sameness	4.50	3.00	N.S.	3.00	4.00	N.S.	2.25	4.75	2.74**
33. Passivity	4.00	5.00	N.S.	5.00	5.25	N.S.	4.00	6.25	N.S.
34. Rejection	2.50	4.00	N.S.	2.25	4.25	4.89***	2.50	4.00	N.S.
35. Autonomy	3.00	3.75	N.S.	3.25	2.75	N.S.	3.25	2.50	N.S.
36. Disjunctivity	4.75	4.25	N.S.	5.00	5.50	N.S.	5.00	5.25	N.S.
37. Blameavoidance	6.00	8.50	N.S.	5.75	8.00	N.S.	6.25	8.75	N.S.
38. Infavoidance	4.75	7.00	N.S.	4.50	6.50	N.S.	3.75	6.50	2.14*
39. Deliberation	5.00	6.25	N.S.	4.00	5.25	N.S.	4.25	6.50	N.S.
40. Placidity	6.75	6.25	N.S.	6.75	7.25	N.S.	6.00	6.75	N.S.

N = 4,4

***.01 > 3.707

**.05 > 2.447

*.10 > 1.943

[1] Unmatched *t* test

Immediately following the completion of counseling, these same four categories exhibited significant heterogeneity between the husbands and wives: 10 - Order, 11 - Harmavoidance and 19 - Affiliation at the .01 level; and 13 - Counteraction at the .05 level. New significance was derived following counseling for category 34 - Rejection at the .01 level. No significant differences were found at the .10 level. None of the four significant categories diminished in criticalness. In fact, it increased in three of them.

The immediate impact of counseling on the inter-sex patterns of the Once a Month group seems minor in effecting new or in reducing previously observed variation. However, it does seem to have increased the variability level in the patterns already present.

On the third test administration significant differences increased. Variables 10 - Order and 11 - Harmavoidance both maintained significant divergence between the two sexes at the .01 level. Variable 19 - Affiliation resumed its pre-counseling pattern with significance at the .05 level and new differences appeared at this level for 32 - Sameness. Significance at the .10 level occurred in 23 - Aggression, 28 - Exhibitionism, 29 - Impulsion and 38 - Infavoidance. The pattern maintained for Test I and II on 13 - Counteraction and that originating at Test II for 34 - Rejection did not maintain itself over this extended period. *For the most part, the significant needs are concerned with interpersonal relations and individual behavior patterns.*

Distributed counseling treatment seems to have a negligible immediate effect upon alteration of the frequency or pattern of inter-sex variation on need personality variables described by the 40 SAI categories. However, the delayed effect of counseling seems to promote additional variation in some areas while still essentially maintaining previously existent trends.

The overall pattern for the Once a Month group t test comparisons on various attitudes and need patterns is similar to that noted for the Twice A Month group although there is less variation on all but AMR scores for this least concentrated group. In the bulk of the areas the incidence of inter-sex variation is greater than for the most concentrated Cazenovia group but less than the Minnowbrook group. On the PARI and the GSC, the most frequent initial and subsequent variability occurs for the Minnowbrook group. The Twice a Month group shows the most deviation on SAI scores, followed by the Minnowbrook and the Once a Month group. Minimal variation is observed on the AMR items in all four clinic groups but the Minnowbrook and Twice a Month group exhibit somewhat more than the other two. It seems that the initial level of inter-sex variation within the specific clinic group has as much effect on subsequent patterns and frequency as the presence of the counseling variable and/or its specific format.

E. Control Group

A presentation of the comparison of all scores for the two test periods (I and III) for the Control group is made here for use in contrast to the other project groups.

1. Discomfort Relief Quotient (DRQ)(Table 374)

Significant variation at the .05 level was noted for category 3 - Activity-Goals. No significant differences were found at the .01 or the .10 levels.

Thus initial sex variation within the control group exists on the scores derived from the information obtained through the interview. The obtained sex variability occurs in the achievement related area rather than those topics more concerned with interpersonal relationships. This information may prove pertinent in its consideration with the other data.

TABLE 374

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE CONTROL GROUP ON IRQ SCORES[1]

Categories	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
1. Intra-Family	40.85	52.87	N.S.
2. Neighborhood	26.85	30.00	N.S.
3. Activity-Goals	29.57	56.25	2.26**
4. Community	50.00	65.00	N.S.
5. Parental Relationships	36.71	51.00	N.S.

N = 7,8
df = 13
***.01 > 3.012
**.05 > 2.160
*.10 > 1.771

[1] Unmatched t test

2. Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI)(Table 375)

Initial father-mother differences on the 19 comparable PARI categories reached statistical significance in two cases: 17 - Expression of Affection at the .01 level; and 14 - Suppression of Sexuality at the .05 level. No differences appeared at the .10 level. Both these areas have primary focus on parental behavior toward and with a child.

TABLE 375

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE CONTROL GROUP ON PARI SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
1. Encouraging Verbalization	18.14	17.25	N.S.	16.57	18.50	N.S.
2. Fostering Dependency	12.43	9.63	N.S.	11.43	8.63	N.S.
3. Seclusiveness	11.00	10.13	N.S.	11.57	9.75	N.S.
4. Breaking the Will	11.00	8.88	N.S.	9.57	7.25	N.S.
5. Marital Conflict	16.85	14.62	N.S.	16.28	1.61	N.S.
6. Strictness	13.71	11.25	N.S.	13.29	12.75	N.S.
7. Irritability	11.29	12.75	N.S.	11.29	15.50	2.68**
8. Excluding Outside Influences	10.86	9.13	N.S.	10.29	9.13	N.S.
9. Deification of Parent	11.14	10.75	N.S.	10.71	9.00	N.S.
10. Suppression of Aggression	8.14	9.25	N.S.	8.71	7.00	N.S.
11. Equalitarianism	17.28	16.00	N.S.	17.00	17.37	N.S.
12. Avoidance of Communication	8.43	10.25	N.S.	9.14	9.88	N.S.
13. Inconsiderateness	12.14	11.75	N.S.	13.57	10.63	N.S.
14. Suppression of Sexuality	7.00	8.13	2.33**	7.86	7.75	N.S.
15. Ascendancy	11.57	11.25	N.S.	11.43	10.25	N.S.
16. Comradeship and Sharing	17.00	17.75	N.S.	17.57	18.87	N.S.
17. Expression of Affection	13.57	17.50	3.21***	15.28	18.37	N.S.

TABLE 375

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE CONTROL GROUP ON PARI SCORES[1]
(CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
18. Autonomy of Child	17.14	17.00	N.S.	16.57	20.25	7.18***
19. Achievement	21.14	21.12	N.S.	21.28	21.25	N.S.

N = 7,8
df = 13
***.01 >3.012
**.05 >2.160
*.10 >1.771

[1] Unmatched t test

On the second administration, approximately six months later but with no interim counseling treatment, differences in the Control group were obtained for two different attitude categories: 18 - Autonomy of the Child at the .01 level; and 7 - Irritability at the .05 level. Whereas the 7 - Irritability factor reflects a parental reaction to children and children's behavior, 18 - Autonomy of the Child continues in the pattern of the expression of opinion toward parental handling of children.

Over the two test periods the variation between mothers and fathers in the Control group on attitudes pertaining to children and child-rearing practices do not alter sufficiently to indicate beyond chance occurrence.

3. Attitude Scale Toward Mental Retardation (AMR)(Table 376)

No statistically significant differences between the male and female subjects of the Control group on attitudes toward retardation were obtained for either of the two administrations of the AMR. No unusual initial variation exists on these items and none develops between the first and second testing session.

TABLE 376

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE CONTROL GROUP ON AMR SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
1. Sexuality	7.71	8.38	N.S.	7.57	8.25	N.S.
2. Genetic Responsibility	4.14	4.13	N.S.	4.71	5.00	N.S.
3. Appearance	4.43	4.38	N.S.	5.29	4.50	N.S.
4. Normalcy of Development	43.28	39.37	N.S.	41.85	38.00	N.S.
5. Dependency	18.71	20.12	N.S.	19.00	20.50	N.S.
6. Independency	29.00	27.25	N.S.	28.42	26.62	N.S.
7. Aggression	15.28	14,87	N.S.	17.14	14.25	N.S.
8. Guilt	19.00	20.75	N.S.	18.85	19.62	N.S.
9. Peer Interaction	22.57	22.62	N.S.	22.28	22.37	N.S.
10. Concept of Retardation	24.71	29.00	N.S.	22.42	23.75	N.S.
11. Abasement	21.42	24.50	N.S.	21.85	24.37	N.S.
12. Comprehension of Self/Others	13.86	14.00	N.S.	14.14	14.50	N.S.
13. Counteraction	23.71	23.75	N.S.	24.57	22.75	N.S.
14. Educational Implications and Training	23.14	24.00	N.S.	23.57	23.37	N.S.
15. Community Provision	15.71	15.12	N.S.	15.00	14.62	N.S.
16. Emotional-Social Behavior	24.14	23.87	N.S.	25.42	22.00	N.S.
17. Expression of Affection	18.57	18.87	N.S.	19.14	19.25	N.S.
18. Suppression of Sex	6.86	8.13	N.S.	7.29	9.00	N.S.

TABLE 376

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE CONTROL GROUP ON AMR SCORES[1] (CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
19. Encouraging Verbalization	17.71	18.62	N.S.	18.00	18.50	N.S.
20. Excluding Outside Influences	8.71	9.50	N.S.	8.86	10.75	N.S.
21. Avoidance of Communication	7.86	9.50	N.S.	11.00	9.75	N.S.
22. Suppression of Aggression	9.86	10.63	N.S.	10.00	9.88	N.S.
23. Deification	10.14	11.50	N.S.	10.71	10.13	N.S.
24. Comradeship and Sharing	17.85	18.25	N.S.	17.28	20.00	N.S.
25. Strictness	11.29	11.50	N.S.	12.14	13.87	N.S.
26. Breaking the Will	8.57	8.00	N.S.	8.00	78.75	N.S.
27. Irritability	11.29	13.50	N.S.	11.57	13.00	N.S.
28. Autonomy of Child	17.57	17.50	N.S.	16.71	17.75	N.S.
29. Equalitarianism	14.57	14.62	N.S.	16.42	15.75	N.S.
30. Approval of Activity	13.86	14.00	N.S.	12.00	13.37	N.S.
31. Fostering Dependency	9.57	9.75	N.S.	10.71	10.63	N.S.
32. Acceleration of Development	12.14	10.50	N.S.	14.57	12.13	N.S.
33. Achievement	19.85	22.12	N.S.	18.71	23.12	N.S.

N = 7,8
df = 13
***.01>3.012
**.05>2.160
*.10>1.771

[1] Unmatched *t* test

4. Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC): Variable Scores (Table 377)

The t test comparison of the first set of GSC Variable scores yielded significant differences for variable 32 - Succorance at the .05 level, and for 4 - Acquisition and 29 - Sentience at the .10 level. No differences appeared at the .01 level.

TABLE 377

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE CONTROL GROUP ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1]

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
1. Abasement	1.29	1.38	N.S.	1.00	1.63	N.S.
2. Achievement	18.14	19.25	N.S.	18.57	18.62	N.S.
3. Acquiescence	12.43	13.50	N.S.	16.42	13.75	N.S.
4. Acquisition	1.14	2.88	2.02*	1.71	3.00	N.S.
5. Affiliation	17.14	18.60	N.S.	16.28	20.62	2.82**
6. Aggression	3.29	3.13	N.S.	3.29	3.38	N.S.
7. Autonomy	1.14	2.25	N.S.	1.00	1.75	N.S.
8. Avoidance	2.57	1.38	N.S.	3.29	.63	2.44**
9. Benignness	9.00	6.38	N.S.	7.43	7.50	N.S.
10. Counteraction	1.29	1.25	N.S.	1.43	.75	N.S.
11. Deference	2.29	1.75	N.S.	1.43	1.88	N.S.
12. Description	5.14	5.75	N.S.	7.71	4.75	N.S.
13. Dominance	3.57	2.50	N.S.	3.29	1.75	N.S.
14. Identification	3.71	3.00	N.S.	3.29	3.25	N.S.
15. Integrity	3.00	2.88	N.S.	1.86	2.63	N.S.
16. Intellectualism	7.29	6.13	N.S.	6.86	7.88	4.11***
17. Irritability	3.71	2.75	N.S.	3.86	3.00	N.S.
18. Narcissism	.43	.38	N.S.	1.00	.25	N.S.
19. Nurturance	8.71	10.25	N.S.	7.86	9.25	N.S.

TABLE 377

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE CONTROL GROUP ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1] (CONT)

Category	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
20. Omission	5.14	2.38	N.S.	1.86	1.75	N.S.
21. Optimism	1.43	1.88	N.S.	1.57	2.13	N.S.
22. Order	1.43	2.63	N.S.	1.57	1.88	N.S.
23. Pessimism	0	.75	N.S.	.14	.13	N.S.
24. Phobia	1.86	1.88	N.S.	2.14	1.50	N.S.
25. Play	2.43	3.50	N.S.	2.57	3.00	N.S.
26. Refusal	4.71	3.00	N.S.	4.71	3.88	N.S.
27. Rejection	4.57	6.88	N.S.	5.43	8.00	N.S.
28. Seclusion	.29	1.63	N.S.	.57	.63	N.S.
29. Sentience	14.00	8.50	2.00*	13.43	9.00	1.92*
30. Sex	.86	.38	N.S.	.29	.38	N.S.
31. Submissiveness	.71	.25	N.S.	.14	.25	N.S.
32. Succorance	1.86	4.00	2.59**	2.71	3.13	N.S.
33. Supernaturalism	1.43	1.25	N.S.	.86	1.63	N.S.
34. Understanding	1.29	3.13	N.S.	1.00	3.00	1.83*
35. Unhappiness	1.71	1.63	N.S.	3.71	2.50	N.S.

N = 7,8
df = 13
***.01>3.012
**.05>2.160
*.10>1.771

[1] Unmatched *t* test

On the second administration, approximately six months later, significance was found for variable 16 - Intellectualism at the .01 level; 5 - Affiliation and 8 - Avoidance at the .05 level, and 29 - Sentience and 34 - Understanding at the .10 level. This represents a slight increase in heterogeneity between the fathers and mothers.

5. Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC): Direction Scores (Table 378)

Significant initial variation between the male and female Control group population on GSC Direction scores for the first testing period appeared on the 2 - Negative category at the .05 level. Further significance at the .01 and .10 level did not occur. No significant variability appeared on the analysis of the scores for the second administration.

TABLE 378

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE CONTROL GROUP ON GSC DIRECTION SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
1. Positive	87.42	82.62	N.S.	90.85	87.37	N.S.
2. Negative	51.57	58.50	2.52**	48.85	55.62	N.S.
3. Neutral	10.00	7.88	N.S.	9.29	6.00	N.S.

N = 7,8
df = 13
***.01>3.012
**.05>2.160
*.10>1.771

[1] Unmatched t test

6. Stern Activities Index (SAI)(Table 379)

On the SAI scores for the Control population, no significant variation on Administration I was obtained in any of the need variables. On the second administration which was six months later, significant differences at the .05 level were detected in two instances, variables 9 - Deference and 14 - Rejection. No differences at the .01 or .10 levels were obtained. It can be concluded that no significant alteration took place between the men and women Control group subjects from the first to the second administration of the SAI.

TABLE 379

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE CONTROL GROUP ON SAI SCORES[1]

Need Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
1. Sentience	3.86	3.25	N.S.	3.86	3.00	N.S.
2. Sex	3.57	3.13	N.S.	3.14	2.75	N.S.
3. Change	5.29	6.88	N.S.	5.43	7.00	N.S.
4. Play	4.71	5.38	N.S.	3.43	5.13	N.S.
5. Energy	5.29	7.00	N.S.	6.14	6.38	N.S.
6. Pragmatism	6.43	7.38	N.S.	6.29	6.88	N.S.
7. Adaptiveness	3.86	4.25	N.S.	5.43	3.88	N.S.
8. Abasement	4.29	4.50	N.S.	3.86	4.13	N.S.
9. Deference	7.86	7.13	N.S.	4.14	7.75	2.43**
10. Order	4.57	4.88	N.S.	4.71	4.38	N.S.
11. Harmavoidance	6.43	7.75	N.S.	5.71	7.50	N.S.
12. Understanding	5.71	4.87	N.S.	5.86	5.63	N.S.
13. Counteraction	7.00	7.13	N.S.	7.43	6.75	N.S.
14. Achievement	4.43	5.13	N.S.	6.14	5.75	N.S.
15. Reflectiveness	5.57	5.88	N.S.	5.71	6.00	N.S.

TABLE 379

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE CONTROL GROUP ON SAI SCORES[1]
(CONT)

Need Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
16. Humanism	5.00	6.25	N.S.	5.86	5.38	N.S.
17. Scientism	4.71	3.75	N.S.	6.00	3.75	N.S.
18. Objectivity	7.86	6.88	N.S.	7.14	6.75	N.S.
19. Affiliation	6.43	7.88	N.S.	6.71	8.00	N.S.
20. Nurturance	7.57	8.75	N.S.	7.86	9.00	N.S.
21. Succorance	7.86	7.38	N.S.	7.71	8.00	N.S.
22. Conjunctivity	6.29	6.50	N.S.	7.14	7.00	N.S.
23. Aggression	2.71	1.75	N.S.	2.86	2.50	N.S.
24. Dominance	4.57	3.50	N.S.	4.00	4.38	N.S.
25. Narcissism	4.43	5.13	N.S.	4.43	5.00	N.S.
26. Fantasied Achievement	4.14	4.75	N.S.	5.71	5.13	N.S.
27. Ego Achievement	3.29	4.88	N.S.	4.43	4.88	N.S.
28. Exhibitionism	3.00	2.75	N.S.	3.14	2.50	N.S.
29. Impulsion	4.14	5.38	N.S.	4.14	5.75	N.S.
30. Emotionality	4.00	4.38	N.S.	3.86	4.38	N.S.
31. Prudery	6.43	6.88	N.S.	6.86	7.25	N.S.
32. Sameness	4.71	3.13	N.S.	4.57	3.00	N.S.
33. Passivity	4.71	3.00	N.S.	3.86	3.63	N.S.
34. Rejection	3.00	1.69	N.S.	3.36	1.56	2.62**
35. Autonomy	2.43	2.63	N.S.	2.29	2.00	N.S.
36. Disjunctivity	3.71	3.50	N.S.	2.86	3.00	N.S.
37. Blameavoidance	7.29	8.25	N.S.	7.14	7.75	N.S.
38. Infavoidance	5.00	5.06	N.S.	4.71	5.50	N.S.

TABLE 379

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE CONTROL GROUP ON SAI SCORES[1] (CONT)

Need Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
39. Deliberation	5.86	4.63	N.S.	5.86	4.25	N.S.
40. Placidity	6.00	5.63	N.S.	6.14	5.63	N.S.

N = 7,8
df = 13
***.01 > 3.012
**.05 > 2.160
*.10 > 1.771

[1] Unmatched t test

The overall pattern exhibited by the Control group for the two test periods indicates non-significance in both the frequency and pattern of change for all instrument comparisons beyond chance expectation. Incidence of initial variation is also minimal.

F. Clinic Dropout Group

As has been pointed out earlier, the Clinic Dropout group consists of subjects who took the pre-test battery and attended less than three counseling sessions in the Once or Twice a Month format before dropping out for a variety of reasons. As a result, only Test I information on all instruments is available for the Clinic Dropout group. The husband-wife comparison of initial scores on all instrument data has been included here for comparison purposes.

1. Discomfort Relief Quotient (DRQ)(Table 380)

Significant male-female differences on DRQ scores were found for one of the five interview categories, 4 - Community at the .01 level. No further differences at the .05 and .10 levels were obtained. In this group as in others displaying inter-sex variation on DRQ scores, the tendency is for the significance to be centered in the less personalized content areas.

TABLE 380

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE CLINIC DROPOUT GROUP ON IRQ SCORES[1]

Categories	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
1. Intra-Family	57.50	82.00	N.S.
2. Neighborhood	44.50	48.87	N.S.
3. Activity-Goals	74.00	47.62	N.S.
4. Community	74.25	67.87	5.00***
5. Parental Relationships	52.75	42.12	N.S.

N = 4.8
df = 10
***.01 > 3.169
**.05 > 2.228
*.10 > 1.812

[1] Unmatched _t_ test

2. Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI)(Table 381)

On the t test comparison of the husband-wife PARI scores, significant heterogeneity at the .05 level was obtained for one category, 4 - Breaking the Will; and at the .10 level, 16 - Comradeship and Sharing and 19 - Achievement. No differences occurred at the .01 level. All three significant topics are related to goals and parental handling of children both in areas of control and personal closeness.

TABLE 381

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE CLINIC DROPOUT GROUP ON PARI SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	X Husbands	Y Wives	t
1. Encouraging Verbalization	12.50	15.00	N.S.
2. Fostering Dependency	11.00	11.50	N.S.
3. Seclusiveness	12.00	12.50	N.S.
4. Breaking the Will	15.75	11.38	2.70**
5. Marital Conflict	14.75	13.38	N.S.
6. Strictness	14.00	13.00	N.S.
7. Irritability	13.75	13.38	N.S.
8. Excluding Outside Influences	12.25	12.50	N.S.
9. Deification of Parent	11.75	14.00	N.S.
10. Suppression of Aggression	13.25	11.38	N.S.
11. Equalitarianism	13.75	14.75	N.S.
12. Avoidance of Communication	13.50	12.25	N.S.
13. Inconsiderateness	15.00	12.25	N.S.
14. Suppression of Sexuality	13.25	11.38	N.S.
15. Ascendancy	13.50	11.50	N.S.
16. Comradeship and Sharing	11.50	16.88	1.90*
17. Expression of Affection	12.25	17.00	N.S.
18. Autonomy of Child	13.50	15.38	N.S.
19. Achievement	21.50	19.63	1.88*

N = 4,8
df = 10
***.01>3.169
**.05>2.228
*.10>1.812

[1] Unmatched t test

3. Attitude Scale Toward Mental Retardation (AMR)(Table 382)

Differences on AMR scores were obtained for category 4 - Normalcy of Development at the .05 level, and 16 - Emotional-Social Behavior and 27 - Irritability at the .10 level. No differences at the .01 level were obtained. The significant areas touch on topics relevant to the goal expectancy of the parent for the retardate, characteristics of behavior patterns of the retardate and parental discomfort over behavior characteristics of the retarded child.

TABLE 382

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE CLINIC DROPOUT GROUP ON AMR SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
1. Sexuality	11.50	10.75	N.S.
2. Genetic Responsibility	4.25	4.88	N.S.
3. Appearance	5.25	5.25	N.S.
4. Normalcy of Development	33.00	40.37	2.52**
5. Dependency	28.50	24.37	N.S.
6. Independency	25.25	25.75	N.S.
7. Aggression	17.25	16.87	N.S.
8. Guilt	19.75	20.62	N.S.
9. Peer Interaction	29.50	27.12	N.S.
10. Concept of Retardation	30.50	29.62	N.S.
11. Abasement	29.50	26.62	N.S.
12. Comprehension of Self/Others	17.00	16.25	N.S.
13. Counteraction	23.50	24.75	N.S.

TABLE 382

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE CLINIC DROPOUT GROUP ON AMR SCORES[1]
(CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I $\bar{X}$ Husbands	 $\bar{Y}$ Wives	 t
14. Educational Implications and Training	27.75	24.62	N.S.
15. Community Provision	18.50	16.87	N.S.
16. Emotional-Social Behavior	32.00	25.37	2.18*
17. Expression of Affection	15.75	18.62	N.S.
18. Suppression of Sex	8.25	10.25	N.S.
19. Encouraging Verbalization	17.50	16.75	N.S.
20. Excluding Outside Influences	14.50	11.50	N.S.
21. Avoidance of Communication	11.75	10.25	N.S.
22. Suppression of Aggression	12.75	12.00	N.S.
23. Deification	14.25	14.75	N.S.
24. Comradeship and Sharing	19.00	18.25	N.S.
25. Strictness	13.00	12.25	N.S.
26. Breaking the Will	12.75	9.88	N.S.
27. Irritability	16.25	12.00	1.92*
28. Autonomy of Child	17.75	16.12	N.S.
29. Equalitarianism	16.50	16.50	N.S.
30. Approval of Activity	15.00	12.75	N.S.

TABLE 382

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE CLINIC DROPOUT GROUP ON AMR SCORES[1] (CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
31. Fostering Dependency	13.00	13.00	N.S.
32. Acceleration of Development	12.00	12.25	N.S.
33. Achievement	23.00	20.50	N.S.

N = 4,8
df = 10
***.01 > 3.169
**.05 > 2.228
*.10 > 1.812

[1] Unmatched *t* test

4. Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC): Variable Scores (Table 383)

Significant differences on GSC Variable scores were noted for one category variable, 33 - Supernaturalism at the .10 level. No differences at the .01 or .05 levels were obtained. Thus, significant initial variation between the Clinic Dropout group male and female subjects on the need personality variables measured by the GSC are negligible.

TABLE 383

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE CLINIC DROPOUT GROUP ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1]

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
1. Abasement	1.50	1.50	N.S.
2. Achievement	15.25	12.13	N.S.

TABLE 383

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE CLINIC DROPOUT GROUP ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1] (CONT)

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I $\bar{X}$ Husbands	 $\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
3. Acquiescence	14.75	11.88	N.S.
4. Acquisition	1.50	2.00	N.S.
5. Affiliation	14.00	15.87	N.S.
6. Aggression	2.50	3.50	N.S.
7. Autonomy	1.25	1.38	N.S.
8. Avoidance	1.50	1.50	N.S.
9. Benignness	3.00	5.13	N.S.
10. Counteraction	.75	.88	N.S.
11. Deference	.75	1.75	N.S.
12. Description	7.75	3.50	N.S.
13. Dominance	2.75	2.50	N.S.
14. Identification	2.00	1.88	N.S.
15. Integrity	2.00	1.75	N.S.
16. Intellectualism	7.00	5.88	N.S.
17. Irritability	4.00	2.63	N.S.
18. Narcissism	.25	.63	N.S.
19. Nurturance	13.75	12.25	N.S.
20. Omission	7.50	19.75	N.S.
21. Optimism	.75	1.50	N.S.
22. Order	2.25	1.88	N.S.
23. Pessimism	.25	0	N.S.
24. Phobia	1.25	1.38	N.S.
25. Play	4.25	3.38	N.S.
26. Refusal	6.50	3.63	N.S.
27. Rejection	9.00	7.25	N.S.
28. Seclusion	1.25	1.00	N.S.

TABLE 383

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE
CLINIC DROPOUT GROUP ON
GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1]
(CONT)

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I $\bar{X}$ Husbands	 $\bar{Y}$ Wives	 t
29. Sentience	9.50	9.63	N.S.
30. Sex	.50	0	N.S.
31. Submissiveness	.50	0	N.S.
32. Succorance	1.75	2.63	N.S.
33. Supernaturalism	4.00	1.50	2.13*
34. Understanding	2.25	5.25	N.S.
35. Unhappiness	1.25	1.75	N.S.

N = 4,8
df = 10
***.01>3.169
**.05>2.228
*.10>1.812

[1] Unmatched *t* test

5. Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC):Direction Scores (Table 384)

The 2 - Negative Direction category on the GSC showed statistically significant mother-father heterogeneity at the .01 level for the pre-counseling administration. The husbands seemed to have the highest frequency of scores. Differences on the other two directions did not reach significance at the .05 or the .10 level.

TABLE 384

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE CLINIC DROPOUT GROUP ON (GSC) DIRECTION SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
1. Positive	80.50	82.25	N.S.
2. Negative	54.25	42.87	3.45***
3. Neutral	14.25	21.37	N.S.

N = 4,8
df = 10
***.01 > 3.169
**.05 > 2.228
*.10 > 1.812

[1] Unmatched t test

6. Stern Activities Index (SAI) (Table 385)

The comparison of the SAI scores yielded an index of significant differences at the .01 level for category 34 - Rejection, at the .05 level for category 19 - Affiliation, and at the .10 level for 10 - Order, 14 - Achievement and 17 - Scientism. A very small portion of this initial variation seems to exist in areas directly concerned with interpersonal relations. Instead, the divergent emphasis seems to be on intellectual and motivational modes of behavior.

TABLE 385

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE CLINIC DROPOUT GROUP ON SAI SCORES[1]

Need Variables	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
1. Sentience	2.75	3.50	N.S.
2. Sex	3.00	2.88	N.S.
3. Change	5.50	5.75	N.S.
4. Play	6.25	5.13	N.S.
5. Energy	6.25	5.38	N.S.
6. Pragmatism	8.50	6.88	N.S.
7. Adaptiveness	3.75	3.13	N.S.
8. Abasement	4.00	4.00	N.S.
9. Deference	6.75	6.87	N.S.
10. Order	3.75	7.38	1.90*
11. Harmavoidance	6.25	8.38	N.S.
12. Understanding	5.75	5.13	N.S.
13. Counteraction	6.50	5.50	N.S.
14. Achievement	5.75	3.38	2.13*
15. Reflectiveness	5.00	5.88	N.S.
16. Humanism	4.75	7.25	N.S.
17. Scientism	7.25	3.75	2.09*
18. Objectivity	5.00	5.75	N.S.
19. Affiliation	4.25	6.88	2.76**
20. Nurturance	7.50	9.13	N.S.
21. Succorance	6.75	8.13	N.S.
22. Conjunctivity	5.50	5.38	N.S.
23. Aggression	1.75	1.50	N.S.
24. Dominance	3.00	2.75	N.S.
25. Narcissism	5.00	5.13	N.S.

TABLE 385

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE CLINIC DROPOUT GROUP ON SAI SCORES[1] (CONT)

Need Variables	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
26. Fantasied Achievement	6.25	5.00	N.S.
27. Ego Achievement	5.00	3.00	N.S.
28. Exhibitionism	3.00	2.13	N.S.
29. Impulsion	4.25	3.13	N.S.
30. Emotionality	3.25	2.38	N.S.
31. Prudery	7.00	7.13	N.S.
32. Sameness	4.50	4.25	N.S.
33. Passivity	3.75	4.63	N.S.
34. Rejection	4.13	2.00	3.75***
35. Autonomy	3.25	2.00	N.S.
36. Disjunctivity	4.50	3.88	N.S.
37. Blameavoidance	8.25	8.50	N.S.
38. Infavoidance	5.00	6.19	N.S.
39. Deliberation	5.75	6.88	N.S.
40. Placidity	7.00	7.63	N.S.

N = 4,8
df = 10
***.01>3.169
**.05>2.228
*.10>1.812

[1] Unmatched _t_ test

The overall picture of the Clinic Dropout group from this t test comparison of sex differences at the initial testing period seems similar to that noted for the four experimental and the Control group. The frequency of variation between the two sexes does not stand out as being excessive or particularly different. Inter-sex patterns of variation do not seem to provide an adequate explanation for the dropout behavior of these subjects.

G. Attrition Group

A t test comparison on the one set of available scores for the Attrition group was also done to determine initial patterns of heterogeneity of expressed attitude and need patterns between the male and female subjects. This group completed the initial set of instruments but attended no counseling sessions.

1. Discomfort Relief Quotient (DRQ) (Table 386)

Significant husband-wife variation was found for interview category 2 - Neighborhood at the .05 level on the DRQ scores. No further differentiation was obtained at the .01 or the .10 levels. The appearance of significant variability on this rather non-personalized category is consistent with that noted for other groups.

TABLE 386

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE ATTRITION GROUP ON DRQ SCORES[1]

Categories	X Husbands	Y Wives	t
1. Intra-Family	78.66	18.00	N.S.
2. Neighborhood	50.66	15.33	3.04**
3. Activity-Goals	43.66	35.00	N.S.
4. Community	81.00	77.33	N.S.
5. Parental Relationships	30.33	16.67	N.S.

N = 3,3
df = 4
***.01>4.604
**.05>2.776
*.10 2.132

[1] Unmatched t test

2. Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI)(Table 387)

The t test comparison of the mother-father PARI scores yielded significant variation in categories 1 - Encouraging Verbalization and 8 - Excluding Outside Influences at the .05 level, and in 2 - Fostering Dependency at the .10 level. No significance was found at the .01 level. In all three instances the significance occurs in areas related to the protective aspects of child-rearing practices.

TABLE 387

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE ATTRITION GROUP ON PARI SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	X Husbands	Y Wives	t
Encouraging Verbalization	14.00	19.00	3.07**
Fostering Dependency	12.67	8.67	2.26*
Seclusiveness	12.33	9.33	N.S.
Breaking the Will	11.67	10.67	N.S.
Marital Conflict	14.00	16.67	N.S.
Strictness	14.67	14.33	N.S.
Irritability	15.00	15.00	N.S.
Excluding Outside Influences	14.00	8.67	3.44**
Deification of Parent	13.67	9.67	N.S.
Suppression of Aggression	11.33	9.67	N.S.
Equalitarianism	15.00	16.67	N.S.
Avoidance of Communication	12.00	9.33	N.S.
Inconsiderateness	13.67	11.67	N.S.
Suppression of Sexuality	10.67	7.67	N.S.
Ascendancy	13.67	13.00	N.S.

TABLE 387

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE ATTRITION GROUP ON PARI SCORES[1] (CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
16. Comradeship and Sharing	15.33	17.67	N.S.
17. Expression of Affection	15.00	19.00	N.S.
18. Autonomy of Child	14.33	19.67	N.S.
19. Achievement	24.67	22.00	N.S.

N = 3,3
df = 4
***.01 > 4.604
**.05 > 2.776
*.10 > 2.132

[1] Unmatched t test

3. Attitude Scale Toward Mental Retardation (AMR) (Table 388)

Significant inter-sex differences on AMR scores were obtained in categories 9 - Peer Interaction, 16 - Emotional-Social Behavior and 31 - Fostering Dependency at the .05 level, and 7 - Aggression, 14 - Educational Implications and Treatment, 20 - Excluding Outside Influences and 22 - Suppression of Aggression at the .10 level. Again no differences reached statistical significance at the .01 level.

TABLE 388

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE ATTRITION GROUP ON AMR SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
1. Sexuality	10.00	9.33	N.S.
2. Genetic Responsibility	5.33	4.00	N.S.
3. Appearance	4.33	4.00	N.S.
4. Normalcy of Development	38.33	40.66	N.S.
5. Dependency	23.67	20.33	N.S.
6. Independency	26.00	26.33	N.S.
7. Aggression	17.00	12.33	2.75*
8. Guilt	19.33	18.33	N.S.
9. Peer Interaction	26.67	22.00	3.89**
10. Concept of Retardation	27.67	29.67	N.S.
11. Abasement	24.67	23.33	N.S.
12. Comprehension of Self/Others	18.00	14.67	N.S.
13. Counteraction	21.00	24.67	N.S.
14. Educational Implications and Treatment	27.33	22.33	2.16*
15. Community Provision	18.00	16.00	N.S.
16. Emotional-Social Behavior	28.00	22.00	2.78**
17. Expression of Affection	17.67	19.00	N.S.
18. Suppression of Sex	11.00	8.33	N.S.
19. Encouraging Verbalization	15.67	18.67	N.S.

TABLE 388

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE ATTRITION GROUP ON AMR SCORES[1] (CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
20. Excluding Outside Influences	14.00	8.33	2.68*
21. Avoidance of Communication	13.33	11.00	N.S.
22. Suppression of Aggression	10.67	8.67	2.14*
23. Deification	15.67	9.00	N.S.
24. Comradeship and Sharing	17.00	19.00	N.S.
25. Strictness	11.00	13.67	N.S.
26. Breaking the Will	9.00	9.33	N.S.
27. Irritability	13.33	13.00	N.S.
28. Autonomy of Child	17.67	18.33	N.S.
29. Equalitarianism	14.33	16.33	N.S.
30. Approval of Activity	16.00	13.00	N.S.
31. Fostering Dependency	14.33	9.33	2.91**
32. Acceleration of Development	12.00	11.00	N.S.
33. Achievement	22.33	21.67	N.S.

N = 3,3
df = 4
***.01 > 4.604
**.05 > 2.776
*.10 > 2.132

[1] Unmatched t test

The attitude areas which exhibit significance are concerned with the social-educational experiences and potential of the retardate, and the desirable behavior and related parental role in the guidance of the retardate. The frequency of initial variation on these 33 categories which relate to retardation is somewhat greater than that observed for any of the other six groups already considered.

4. Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC): Variable Scores. (Table 389)

Statistically significant initial male-female variability on the GSC need personality variables was found at the .05 level of criticalness for variables 27 - Rejection and 29 - Sentience; and at the .10 level for 4 - Acquisition, 26 - Refusal and 34 - Understanding. No differences were obtained at the .01 level.

TABLE 389

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE ATTRITION GROUP ON GSC . VARIABLE SCORES[1]

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I $\bar{X}$ Husbands	 $\bar{Y}$ Wives	 t
1. Abasement	2.00	.67	N.S.
2. Achievement	26.33	23.33	N.S.
3. Acquiescence	14.00	12.00	N.S.
4. Acquisition	8.00	3.00	2.62*
5. Affiliation	13.33	18.00	N.S.
6. Aggression	3.00	3.33	N.S.
7. Autonomy	2.00	1.00	N.S.
8. Avoidance	2.00	1.00	N.S.
9. Benignness	4.00	8.00	N.S.
10. Counteraction	1.33	.67	N.S.
11. Deference	2.67	2.00	N.S.
12. Description	5.00	2.00	N.S.

TABLE 389

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE ATTRITION GROUP ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1] (CONT)

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
13. Dominance	3.00	3.00	N.S.
14. Identification	2.33	1.67	N.S.
15. Integrity	2.00	3.33	N.S.
16. Intellectualism	8.67	6.33	N.S.
17. Irritability	2.33	3.00	N.S.
18. Narcissism	0	1.00	N.S.
19. Nurturance	7.33	6.00	N.S.
20. Omission	3.00	1.33	N.S.
21. Optimism	.67	.67	N.S.
22. Order	3.00	1.00	N.S.
23. Pessimism	0	.33	N.S.
24. Phobia	.67	2.33	N.S.
25. Play	5.33	3.00	N.S.
26. Refusal	1.33	4.00	2.47*
27. Rejection	12.00	6.33	3.61**
28. Seclusion	.33	1.67	N.S.
29. Sentience	6.33	10.00	4.02**
30. Sex	0	1.00	N.S.
31. Submissiveness	0	3.33	N.S.
32. Succorance	2.67	2.00	N.S.
33. Supernaturalism	2.67	3.00	N.S.
34. Understanding	1.00	7.67	2.14*
35. Unhappiness	.67	3.00	N.S.

N = 3,3 **.05>2.776
df = 4 *.10>2.132
***.01>4.604

[1] Unmatched t test

The areas exhibiting sex variation are primarily concerned with topics of self-gratification, protection and understanding. The frequency of sex variation on this instrument, while not unusual, is slightly greater than that shown at this stage for all of the other groups except Minnowbrook.

5. Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC): Direction Scores. (Table 390)

No significant differences were found on the sex comparison of the Attrition group on GSC Direction scores. Thus, none of the three direction categories show unusual heterogeneity between the men and women on the direction emphasis of the GSC need personality variables.

TABLE 390

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS
IN THE ATTRITION GROUP ON
GSC. DIRECTION SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
1. Positive	80.66	93.00	N.S.
2. Negative	40.33	56.00	N.S.
3. Neutral	8.00	3.33	N.S.

N = 3,3
df = 4
***.01>4.604
**.05>2.776
*.10>2.132

[1] Unmatched t test

6. Stern Activities Index (SAI). (Table 391)

Statistically significant variation of the SAI need variables was noted in only one of the 40 categories, 33 - Passivity at the .05 level. No significant variability was found at either the .01 or the .10 levels.

TABLE 391

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE ATTRITION GROUP ON SAI SCORES[1]

Need Variables	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
1. Sentience	3.00	5.00	N.S.
2. Sex	5.67	5.00	N.S.
3. Change	7.67	7.00	N.S.
4. Play	6.67	5.33	N.S.
5. Energy	6.00	8.00	N.S.
6. Pragmatism	7.00	8.00	N.S.
7. Adaptiveness	5.00	3.00	N.S.
8. Abasement	2.33	3.67	N.S.
9. Deference	7.00	7.67	N.S.
10. Order	3.67	5.67	N.S.
11. Harmavoidance	6.67	4.67	N.S.
12. Understanding	3.67	5.33	N.S.
13. Counteraction	8.00	6.33	N.S.
14. Achievement	5.33	7.33	N.S.
15. Reflectiveness	5.67	6.33	N.S.
16. Humanism	4.33	6.33	N.S.
17. Scientism	4.00	4.33	N.S.
18. Objectivity	6.33	6.33	N.S.
19. Affiliation	8.00	8.33	N.S.
20. Nurturance	7.33	7.33	N.S.
21. Succorance	7.67	5.33	N.S.
22. Conjunctivity	4.67	5.67	N.S.
23. Aggression	3.33	2.33	N.S.
24. Dominance	5.00	3.33	N.S.
25. Narcissism	5.33	3.67	N.S.
26. Fantasied Achievement	7.33	6.00	N.S.

TABLE 391

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE ATTRITION GROUP ON SAI SCORES[1] (CONT)

Need Variables	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
27. Ego Achievement	3.67	5.00	N.S.
28. Exhibitionism	5.33	4.33	N.S.
29. Impulsion	4.67	4.33	N.S.
30. Emotionality	2.33	2.67	N.S.
31. Prudery	4.33	5.00	N.S.
32. Sameness	2.33	3.00	N.S.
33. Passivity	4.00	2.00	4.55**
34. Rejection	1.67	2.50	N.S.
35. Autonomy	2.33	4.67	N.S.
36. Disjunctivity	5.33	4.33	N.S.
37. Blameavoidance	6.67	7.67	N.S.
38. Infavoidance	3.33	4.67	N.S.
39. Deliberation	5.33	5.67	N.S.
40. Placidity	7.67	7.33	N.S.

N = 3,3
df = 4
***.01 > 4.604
**.05 > 2.776
*.10 > 2.132

[1] Unmatched *t* test

This negligible occurrence of significance indicates no basic pattern of sex heterogeneity on SAI need variables. This finding is similar to that on the initial battery for the other groups.

The overall pattern of initial sex heterogeneity on the expressed attitudes and need patterns elicited by the five instruments does not show unusual variation, nor does it differ appreciably in frequency or pattern from that noted for the other groups. Basic inter-sex differences do not seem to exist in the Attrition population.

H. Contact Group

1. Discomfort Relief Quotient (DRQ). (Table 392)

A t-test comparison was performed on the DRQ scores of the husbands and wives of the Contact group. Since this group is comprised of individuals who were administered the interview but did not complete the Test I battery nor attend any counseling sessions, the DRQ scores are the only data available. Differences at the .05 level of confidence were obtained for category 5 - Parental Relationships. No further significance was obtained at the .01 or .10 levels. This and the Twice a Month group (Table 362) represent the only occasions upon which sex differences reach a critical level on the 5 - Parental Relationships category.

TABLE 392

COMPARISON BETWEEN MOTHERS AND FATHERS IN THE CONTACT GROUP ON DRQ . SCORES[1]

Categories	$\bar{X}$ Husbands	$\bar{Y}$ Wives	t
1. Intra-Family	44.89	40.63	N.S.
2. Neighborhood	32.04	34.75	N.S.
3. Activity-Goals	55.60	56.50	N.S.
4. Community	61.64	59.16	N.S.
5. Parental Relationships	22.75	43.58	2.62**

N = 28,24
df = 50
***.01 > 2.680
**.05 > 2.011
*.10 > 1.684

[1] Unmatched *t* test

In general, the initial husband-wife patterns observed for the groups which did not begin or did not complete counseling are similar to each other in frequency and pattern on the various instrument scores relevant to expressed attitudes and need personality patterns.

The patterns within the four experimental groups were commented upon at the completion of the results for the Once a Month group.

For the most part, inter-sex variation is minor for all test periods of the eight groups. Certain trends in the increase or decrease of variability with counseling and/or the post-counseling period are noted in select groups on certain of the attitude or need patterns measured by the various instruments. There does not seem to be sufficient alteration, however, to attribute a major causation of sex heterogeneity on any of the instrument patterns to the counseling. In addition, some differentiation seems to exist between the four counseling groups so that specific time spacing of the counseling periods does not seem to have a statistically significant effect on the overall frequency or pattern of male-female variability on the attitudes and need personality patterns investigated by the five measures.

QUESTION 8. WHAT DIFFERENCES IN ATTITUDES AND NEED PERSONALITY STRUCTURE EXIST BETWEEN THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS AND THE CONTROL GROUPS?

Since the Control group was included in the testing design as a comparison population for the experimental groups, an unmatched t test was performed between the first and third test scores (only the first for the DRQ) from each instrument on the Combined Clinic groups in contrast to the comparable first and second administrations for the Control group.

A. Discomfort Relief Quotient (DRQ)

The comparison of the initial DRQ scores (Table 393) yielded statistical significance at the .01 level in four of the five interview categories: 1 - Intra-Family, 2 - Neighborhood, 3 - Activity-Goals and 4 - Community. No significant differences were obtained at the .05 and .10 levels.

TABLE 393

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND
THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON
DRQ SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		t
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	
1. Intra-Family	47.27	49.85	3.17***
2. Neighborhood	28.53	50.63	55.26***
3. Activity-Goals	45.80	48.27	3.68***
4. Community	58.00	68.23	8.69***
5. Parental Relationships	44.33	45.77	N.S.

N = 15,52
df = 65
***.01 > 2.660
**.05 > 2.000
*.10 > 1.671

[1] Unmatched *t* test

All interview areas show significant heterogeneity between the two groups except the more personally oriented one, 5 - Parental Relationships. This general tendency for variation to occur in the less personalized areas is also observed for other comparisons. The category yielding the greatest t-ratio between the counseling and the non-counseling group is 2 - Neighborhood. This same category is the only one indicating significant initial intra-study population variation on the analysis of variance in Question 3 (Table 18).

The same comparison for the father sub-groups (Table 394) yielded statistical significance for categories 2 - Neighborhood and 4 - Community at the .01 level. Here again, no further differences were obtained at the .05 or .10 levels.

TABLE 394

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND
THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS
ON IRQ SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Intra-Family	40.86	42.38	N.S.
2. Neighborhood	26.86	43.00	58.00***
3. Activity-Goals	33.86	38.57	N.S.
4. Community	50.00	64.57	3.79***
5. Parental Relationships	36.71	39.00	N.S.

N = 7,21
df = 26
***.01>2.779
**.05>2.056
*.10>1.706

[1] Unmatched t test

These two categories are contextually related to each other. They also represent areas where greater variability within a male population might be expected due to the influence of interests, job, and home demands. Both these areas also show significant t-scores for the entire population analysis. Interestingly, these categories are the only two which do not show initial variability at a critical level for the total population in the Question 3 analysis of variance (Tables 19, 20, 21). It seems that the variation noted here might be unique between the two groups being compared in this analysis.

The mother sub-populations (Table 395) yielded significant variation in three of the five interview areas at the .01 level, 2 - Neighborhood, 3 - Activity-Goals, and 4 - Community. No significant differences were apparent at the .05 and .10 levels.

TABLE 395
COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON IRQ SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I X	Y	t
1. Intra-Family	52.88	54.90	N.S.
2. Neighborhood	30.00	55.81	9.40***
3. Activity-Goals	56.25	54.84	4.50***
4. Community	65.00	70.71	2.95***
5. Parental Relationships	51.00	50.35	N.S.

N = 8,31
df = 37
***.01>2.704
**.05>2.021
*.10>1.684

[1] Unmatched t test

These categories reflect the less personalized areas covered by the interview format, a pattern noted for the total group and the male subgroup comparison also. The heterogeneity between these two groups is unique for this comparison in contrast to that of the total population in Question 3 where no significance was obtained. The variation noted between the Combined Clinic and Control groups of mothers seems to be segmented into differences between these two groups and does not seem indicative of overall hererogeneity. Indices of the stability of these differences on the same type of scores are not available as the interview, from which the quantified DRQ scores were obtained, was administered only on one occasion -- prior to the pre-test and initiation of counseling.

B. Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI)

The comparison of the Test I PARI scores of the Combined Clinic and the Control group (Table 396) yielded significant t's at the .01 level for category 19 - Achievement at the .05 level for 10 - Suppression of Aggression and 14 - Suppression of Sexuality, and at the .10 level for 7 - Irritability and 9 - Deification of Parent.

TABLE 396

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON PARI SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Encouraging Verbalization	17.67	17.00	N.S.	18.33	18.23	N.S.
2. Fostering Dependency	10.00	10.83	N.S.	9.93	10.88	N.S.
3. Seclusiveness	10.53	10.83	N.S.	10.60	10.77	N.S.
4. Breaking the Will	9.87	10.62	N.S.	9.00	9.86	N.S.
5. Marital Conflict	15.67	14.75	N.S.	16.20	15.10	N.S.

TABLE 396

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON PARI SCORES[1] (CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I $\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t	ADMINISTRATION II $\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
6. Strictness	12.47	13.46	N.S.	13.00	13.86	N.S.
7. Irritability	12.07	13.73	1.78*	13.53	13.46	N.S.
8. Excluding Outside Influences	9.93	11.42	N.S.	9.67	11.15	N.S.
9. Deification of Parent	10.93	12.77	1.76*	9.80	12.94	2.78***
10. Suppression of Aggression	8.73	10.58	2.64**	7.80	10.31	3.44***
11. Equalitarianism	16.60	16.56	N.S.	17.20	17.29	N.S.
12. Avoidance of Communication	9.40	10.60	N.S.	9.53	10.02	N.S.
13. Inconsiderateness	11.93	12.10	N.S.	12.00	13.25	N.S.
14. Suppression of Sexuality	7.60	9.52	2.41**	7.80	8.38	N.S.
15. Ascendancy	11.40	11.15	N.S.	10.80	11.60	N.S.
16. Comradeship and Sharing	17.40	17.56	N.S.	18.27	18.27	N.S.
17. Expression of Affection	15.67	17.02	N.S.	17.60	18.31	N.S.
18. Autonomy of Child	17.33	17.73	N.S.	18.53	18.21	N.S.
19. Achievement	21.13	22.10	7.15***	21.27	23.17	4.50***

N = 15,52
df = 65
***.01>2.660
**.05>2.000
*.10>1.671

[1] Unmatched t test

The areas of emphasis encompass child-rearing practices, parental reactions and self concept as well as achievement aspirations. These areas are fairly well distributed so that no one interpretation can explain these differences. In a pattern similar to that noted for the preceding contrast of DRQ scores, only two of these categories (10 - Suppression of Aggression and 14 - Suppression of Sexuality) are among the seven categories displaying significant initial variation within the total study population on Question 3 (Tables 22-28). These two areas of overlap are related more directly to child-rearing practices than many of the other variables.

On the second comparison of PARI scores, significant differences were observed in 9 - Deification of Parent 10 - Suppression of Aggression and 19 - Achievement at the .01 level. No additional variation at the .05 or .10 level appeared.

All three significant categories also show significance prior to the period of counseling. Differences noted in these specific categories on the first comparison seem to be maintained and strengthened over the period of time encompassing the counseling and post-counseling period for the Combined Clinic groups and the period of no contact for the Control group. Differences initially noted in two topics, 7 - Irritability and 14 - Suppression of Sexuality are no longer observable at the critical level. Thus the counseling experience seems to have effected a slightly greater degree of homogeneity on PARI scores.

The comparison of the data from the husbands (Table 397) showed initial differences in six of the 30 categories: 14 - Suppression of Sexuality at the .01 level: 5 - Marital Conflict at the .05 level, and 10 - Suppression of Aggression, 12 - Avoidance of Communication, 24 - Irresponsibility of Father and 30 - Past Orientation at the .10 level.

TABLE 397

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON PARI SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Encouraging Verbalization	18.14	16.28	N.S.	18.00	17.19	N.S.
2. Fostering Dependency	10.43	10.86	N.S.	11.43	11.48	N.S.

TABLE 397

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON PARI SCORES[1] (CONT)

	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
Categories	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
3. Seclusiveness	11.00	10.24	N.S.	11.57	10.05	N.S.
4. Breaking the Will	11.00	10.81	N.S.	9.57	9.57	N.S.
5. Marital Conflict	16.86	14.48	2.07**	16.28	15.14	N.S.
6. Strictness	13.71	12.86	N.S.	13.28	13.38	N.S.
7. Irritability	11.28	12.67	N.S.	11.28	11.71	N.S.
8. Excluding Outside Influences	10.86	11.28	N.S.	10.28	11.28	N.S.
9. Deification of Parent	11.14	12.28	N.S.	10.71	12.81	N.S.
10. Suppression of Aggression	8.14	9.81	1.95*	8.71	9.48	N.S.
11. Equalitarianism	17.28	16.71	N.S.	17.00	17.43	N.S.
12. Avoidance of Communication	8.43	10.43	1.74*	9.14	9.62	N.S.
13. Inconsiderateness	12.14	12.28	N.S.	13.57	12.71	N.S.
14. Suppression of Sexuality	7.00	9.81	2.84***	7.86	8.38	N.S.
15. Ascendancy	11.57	10.43	N.S.	11.43	10.95	N.S.
16. Comradeship and Sharing	17.00	17.24	N.S.	17.57	17.76	N.S.
17. Expression of Affection	13.57	14.62	N.S.	15.28	16.10	N.S.
18. Autonomy of Child	17.14	16.81	N.S.	16.57	17.38	N.S.
19. Achievement	21.14	22.33	N.S.	21.28	23.57	N.S.
20. Harsh Punishment	10.71	10.76	N.S.	10.00	10.67	N.S.
21. Deception	9.00	9.95	N.S.	9.71	9.14	N.S.
22. Non-punishment	7.43	9.10	N.S.	8.86	9.28	N.S.
23. Demanding Activity	12.86	12.67	N.S.	12.86	13.48	N.S.
24. Irresponsibility of Father	7.86	10.38	2.03*	9.28	9.62	N.S.

TABLE 397

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON PARI SCORES[1]
(CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
25. Avoidance of Expression of Affection	9.86	10.52	N.S.	11.28	10.10	N.S.
26. Complaint of Ascendancy of Wife	11.00	10.71	N.S.	10.86	10.43	N.S.
27. Suppression of Affection	12.28	11.67	N.S.	11.86	11.95	N.S.
28. Change Orientation	13.14	12.24	N.S.	11.28	12.62	N.S.
29. Forcing Independence	13.28	12.38	N.S.	12.71	12.76	N.S.
30. Past Orientation	13.86	12.24	1.87*	13.57	13.19	N.S.

N = 7,21
df = 26
***.01>2.779
**.05>2.056
*.10>1.706

[1] Unmatched _t_ test

Here, as in the total group comparisons, differences exist in a variety of areas--marital and personal parental adjustment as well as principles and practices relevant to child-rearing. Three of these areas are represented in the eight categories showing initial male sub-population variability in Question 3 (Tables 29-36).

On the second comparison, these same sub-groups demonstrated no inter-group differences at the criterion levels for any of the 33 categories. Variation noted 6-9 months earlier seems to have been modified and no new patterns are apparent. It would seem that here again the counseling treatments given the components of the Combined Clinic group tend to diminish differences between these two male sub-groups.

The comparison of the mother subjects (Table 398) provided significant variation on the first comparison in four of the 26 PARI categories: 26 - Dependency of Mother at the .05 level; and 6 - Strictness, 8 - Excluding Outside Influences and 10 - Suppression of Aggression at the .10 level. No differences were obtained at the .01 level.

TABLE 398

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON PARI SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Encouraging Verbalization	17.25	17.48	N.S.	18.62	18.94	N.S.
2. Fostering Dependency	9.62	10.19	N.S.	8.62	10.48	1.69*
3. Seclusiveness	10.12	11.22	N.S.	9.75	11.26	N.S.
4. Breaking the Will	8.88	10.48	N.S.	8.50	10.06	N.S.
5. Marital Conflict	14.62	14.94	N.S.	1.61	15.06	N.S.
6. Strictness	11.38	13.87	1.99*	12.75	14.19	N.S.
7. Irritability	12.75	14.45	N.S.	15.50	14.64	N.S.
8. Excluding Outside Influences	9.12	11.52	1.86*	9.12	11.06	N.S.
9. Deification of Parent	10.75	13.10	N.S.	9.00	13.03	2.57**
10. Suppression of Aggression	9.25	11.10	1.82*	7.00	10.87	3.92***
11. Equalitarianism	16.00	16.45	N.S.	17.38	17.19	N.S.
12. Avoidance of Communication	10.25	10.71	N.S.	9.88	10.29	N.S.
13. Inconsiderateness	11.75	11.97	N.S.	10.62	13.61	2.39**

TABLE 398

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON PARI SCORES[1]

(CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
14. Suppression of Sexuality	8.12	9.32	N.S.	7.75	8.39	N.S.
15. Ascendancy	11.25	11.64	N.S.	10.25	12.03	N.S.
16. Comradeship and Sharing	17.75	17.77	N.S.	18.88	18.61	N.S.
17. Expression of Affection	17.50	18.64	N.S.	19.62	19.81	N.S.
18. Autonomy of Child	17.50	18.35	N.S.	20.25	18.77	2.17**
19. Achievement	21.12	2.94	N.S.	21.25	22.90	N.S.
20. Martyrdom	8.75	9.13	N.S.	7.75	9.42	N.S.
21. Fear of Harming the Baby				13.00	13.58	N.S.
22. Rejection of the Home-Making Role	11.00	11.06	N.S.	9.50	11.54	N.S.
23. Approval of Activity	11.12	13.26	N.S.	13.50	13.26	N.S.
24. Intrusiveness	9.25	10.52	N.S.	8.12	10.74	1.78*
25. Acceleration of Development	10.62	11.71	N.S.	13.00	11.84	N.S.
26. Dependency of Mother	9.12	12.35	2.69**	9.50	12.61	2.24**

N = 8,31
df = 37
***.01 > 2.704
**.05 > 2.021
*.10 > 1.684

[1] Unmatched *t* test

As the majority of these differences occur at the .10 level, initial significance between the two groups on the attitudes relevant to children and child-rearing practices is considered minimal. The only category which appears at the .05 level is more relevant to the marital adjustment of the mothers. Only one of the categories, 6 - Strictness, which exhibits initial differences is also noted as among the four significant categories within the total study female population on Question 3 (Tables 37-40).

The second comparison of the PARI scores of the mothers showed an increase in differences. Significance was derived: at the .01 level for category 10 - Suppression of Aggression; at the .05 level for 9 - Deification of Parent, 13 - Inconsiderateness, 18 - Autonomy of Child and 26 - Dependency of Mother; and at the .10 level for 2 - Fostering Dependency and 24 - Intrusiveness.

In two instances, 10 - Suppression of Aggression and 26 - Dependency of the mother, differences noted on the first comparison either maintain or increase their critical ratio. In the other five cases, the significant differentiation represents new patterns. The rest of the variation noted initially is reduced. Marital and personal adjustment of the parent and child-rearing practices are areas which are influenced by counseling in the female group.

Generally, some change occurs between the Combined Clinic and the Control groups over the two comparison periods. For the most part initial differences are not excessive. The tendency is for the total group and the male sub-group to diminish in initial heterogeneity whereas the tendency for the females seems to be the opposite.. Counseling seems to have an impact upon the general child-rearing pattern of the parents.

C. Attitude Scale Toward Mental Retardation (AMR)

The initial comparison of the attitudes specifically referrent to retardation (Table 399) yielded differences at one of the three criterion levels in 16 of the 33 categories of the AMR: 4 - Normalcy of Development, 5 - Dependency, 9 - Peer Interaction, 10 - Concept of Retardation, and 12 - Comprehension of Self and Others at the .01 level; 1 - Sexuality, 6 - Independency, 11 - Abasement, 16 - Emotional-Social Behavior and 23 - Deification at the .05 level; and 15 - Community Provision, 18 - Suppression of Sexuality 20 - Excluding Outside Influences, 26 - Breaking the Will, 30 - Approval of Activity and 31 - Fostering Dependency at the .10 level.

TABLE 399

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON AMR SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Sexuality	8.07	9.92	2.08**	7.93	9.50	1.84*
2. Genetic Responsibility	4.13	4.69	N.S.	4.87	4.63	N.S.
3. Appearance	4.40	5.02	N.S.	4.87	5.00	N.S.
4. Normalcy of Development	41.20	36.40	3.91***	39.80	36.33	2.53**
5. Dependency	19.47	23.15	2.93***	19.80	23.38	5.20***
6. Independency	28.07	26.54	2.03**	27.47	26.73	N.S.
7. Aggression	15.07	16.71	N.S.	15.60	15.98	N.S.
8. Guilt	19.93	20.13	N.S.	19.27	20.60	N.S.
9. Peer Interaction	22.60	26.44	3.30***	22.33	26.67	3.62***
10. Concept of Retardation	27.00	20.28	3.14***	25.80	30.48	4.10***
11. Abasement	23.07	26.04	2.60**	23.20	26.92	8.88***
12. Comprehension of Self/Others	13.93	17.36	2.72***	15.00	17.02	1.84*
13. Counteraction	23.73	24.00	N.S.	23.60	23.98	N.S.
14. Educational Implications and Training	23.60	24.83	N.S.	23.47	23.42	N.S.
15. Community Provision	15.40	17.04	1.98*	14.80	16.86	2.52**
16. Emotional-Social Behavior	24.00	27.42	2.62**	23.60	25.35	2.59**

TABLE 399

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON AMR SCORES[1]

(CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	$\bar{\bar{X}}$	$\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t	$\bar{\bar{X}}$	$\bar{\bar{Y}}$	t
17. Expression of Affection	18.73	18.71	N.S.	19.20	19.29	N.S.
18. Suppression of Sex	7.53	9.15	1.96*	8.20	8.38	N.S.
19. Encouraging Verbalization	18.20	17.25	N.S.	18.27	18.10	N.S.
20. Excluding Outside Influences	9.13	10.81	1.74*	9.87	10.42	N.S.
21. Avoidance of Communication	8.73	10.06	N.S.	10.33	9.50	N.S.
22. Suppression of Aggression	10.27	10.77	N.S.	9.93	10.42	N.S.
23. Deification	10.87	13.04	2.19**	10.40	13.48	2.78***
24. Comradeship and Sharing	18.07	17.79	N.S.	18.07	18.31	N.S.
25. Strictness	12.07	12.69	N.S.	13.07	13.62	N.S.
26. Breaking the Will	8.27	9.94	1.77*	7.93	9.10	N.S.
27. Irritability	12.47	13.54	N.S.	12.33	14.52	N.S.
28. Autonomy of Child	17.53	17.42	N.S.	17.27	18.19	1.80*
29. Equalitarianism	15.93	16.77	N.S.	16.73	16.73	N.S.
30. Approval of Activity	13.93	12.19	1.84*	12.73	12.98	N.S.
31. Fostering Dependency	9.67	11.46	1.96*	10.67	11.85	N.S.
32. Acceleration of Development	11.93	11.65	N.S.	13.27	11.92	N.S.
33. Achievement	21.07	21.15	N.S.	21.07	21.48	N.S.

N = 15,52
df = 65
***.01>2.660
**.05>2.000
*.10>1.671

[1] Unmatched t test

Variation between these two groups seems to be unique when one notes that only two AMR categories exhibit initial variability on Question 3. The content areas specifically reflecting differences are quite representative of the total AMR: achievement, social development and relations, parental and societal handling of the retardate and parental reaction to and understanding of retardation.

The second comparison of these two groups on AMR variables provided significant differences in 11 category areas: 5 - Dependency, 9 - Peer Inter-Action, 10 - Concept of Retardation, 11 - Abasement and 23 - Deification at the .01 level; 4 - Normalcy of Development, 15 - Community Provision and 16 - Emotional-Social Behavior at the .05 level; and 1 - Sexuality, 12 - Comprehension of Self and Others and 28 - Autonomy of the Child at the .10 level.

In all but one instance, 28 - Autonomy of the Child, the significant category areas are carry-overs from the initial testing comparison. Differences have declined in six areas. It seems that the counseling treatments tend to increase the homogeneity of the clinic groups when they are contrasted with the Control group. New patterns of variation do not appear and the frequency of significant deviation is decreased. However, the incidence of difference is still at a critical level indicating major differences between the two groups on variables relevant to retardation, adjustment to it and the development and handling of the retardate as measured by the AMR items. Those areas in which divergence decreases over the 6-9 month period are exclusively related to practices for the handling and rearing of the retardate and not to personal understanding of, or adaptation to retardation.

The same comparison performed for the father sub-populations of both groups (Table 400) showed statistical significance for the initial administration in ten categories: 4 - Normalcy of Development, 9 - Peer Interaction and 23 - Deification at the .05 level; and 1 - Sexuality, 5 - Dependency, 6 - Independency, 8 - Guilt, 10 - Concept of Retardation, 18 - Suppression of Sexuality and 21 - Avoidance of Communication at the .10 level. No differences reached significance at the .01 level.

TABLE 400

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON AMR SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Sexuality	7.71	9.95	1.86*	7.57	9.33	N.S.
2. Genetic Responsibility	4.14	4.52	N.S.	4.71	4.33	N.S.
3. Appearance	4.43	4.90	N.S.	5.28	4.67	N.S.
4. Normalcy of Development	43.28	36.28	2.46**	41.86	36.71	1.80*
5. Dependency	18.71	21.90	2.01*	19.00	22.38	N.S.
6. Independency	29.00	26.76	1.95*	28.43	27.33	N.S.
7. Aggression	15.28	15.90	N.S.	17.14	15.57	N.S.
8. Guilt	19.00	20.81	1.77*	18.86	20.19	N.S.
9. Peer Interaction	22.57	25.62	2.10**	22.28	26.00	2.38**
10. Concept of Retardation	24.71	29.24	1.92	25.28	28.24	N.S.
11. Abasement	21.43	25.43	N.S.	21.86	25.67	N.S.
12. Comprehension of Self/Others	13.86	16.38	N.S.	14.14	16.52	1.77*
13. Counteraction	23.71	23.95	N.S.	24.57	24.28	N.S.
14. Educational Implications and Training	23.14	24.28	N.S.	23.57	23.33	N.S.
15. Community Provision	15.71	17.28	N.S.	15.00	16.57	N.S.
16. Emotional-Social Behavior	24.14	27.05	N.S.	25.43	24.38	N.S.
17. Expression of Affection	18.57	18.14	N.S.	19.14	18.62	N.S.
18. Suppression of Sex	6.86	8.86	2.00*	7.28	8.24	N.S.
19. Encouraging Verbalization	17.71	16.90	N.S.	18.00	17.90	N.S.
20. Excluding Outside Influences	8.71	10.43	N.S.	8.86	9.76	N.S.

TABLE 400

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON AMR SCORES[1] (CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	X	Y	t	X	Y	t
21. Avoidance of Communication	7.86	9.81	1.84*	11.00	9.19	N.S.
22. Suppression of Aggression	9.86	10.14	N.S.	10.00	9.86	N.S.
23. Deification	10.14	13.43	2.11**	10.71	14.19	2.07**
24. Comradeship and Sharing	17.86	17.24	N.S.	17.28	18.10	N.S.
25. Strictness	11.28	12.14	N.S.	12.14	13.76	N.S.
26. Breaking the Will	8.57	9.28	N.S.	8.00	9.57	N.S.
27. Irritability	11.28	12.90	N.S.	11.57	14.19	N.S.
28. Autonomy of Child	17.57	16.81	N.S.	16.71	17.62	N.S.
29. Equalitarianism	16.00	16.43	N.S.	16.43	16.00	N.S.
30. Approval of Activity	13.86	12.05	N.S.	12.00	13.86	N.S.
31. Fostering Dependency	9.57	11.81	N.S.	10.71	11.81	N.S.
32. Acceleration of Development	12.14	12.19	N.S.	14.57	12.90	N.S.
33. Achievement	19.86	21.48	N.S.	18.71	23.10	N.S.

N = 7,21
df = 26
***.01 > 2.779
**.05 > 2.056
*.10 > 1.706

[1] Unmatched *t* test

There is a general tendency for topics similar to those noted for the full group (Table 399) to also show variability for this sub-group. There is significant variation between the Combined Clinic and the Control group males on items relating to the understanding and self involvement of the parent as well as those more specifically concerned with concepts of retardation and handling of the retarded child. Here, for the first time, the pattern noted for the initial variability of the study father sub-group (Tables 43-49) is essentially similar to that noted for this contrast. This suggests that this variation is more representative for the overall study male population than it is exclusively unique in this particular contrast.

On the comparison of the scores for the last administration of the AMR to both groups, a diminution of significant t-ratios was observed. No differences at the .01 level of significance were obtained. Categories 9 - Peer Interaction and 23 - Deification reached the .05 level, and 4 - Normalcy of Development and 12 - Comprehension of Self and Others, the .10 level of significance..

In all but 12 - Comprehension of Self and Others, these differences represent a continuation of variability noted prior to the counseling treatment. Thus differences decrease significantly in seven categories during the interim span for both groups. While only minimal variability between the two groups exists at this later point, it still reflects both aspects of major concern previously noted, parental self-maintenance in regard to the retardation, as well as the utilization of practices and principles in caring for the retardate. The pattern for the reduction of variation between the males in the Clinic and the Control group is consistent for these specific AMR scales with the emphasis noted for the more generalized aspects of child-rearing practices on the PARI.

The initial comparison of the mother segment of the two groups on AMR scores (Table 401) yielded indices of significant differences for four of the 33 categories: 5 - Dependency, 9 - Peer Interaction and 12 - Comprehension of Self and Others at the .05 level; and 26 - Breaking the Will at the .10 level. No categories reached significance at the .01 level.

TABLE 401

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON AMR SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Sexuality	8.38	9.90	N.S.	8.25	9.61	N.S.
2. Genetic Responsibility	4.12	4.81	N.S.	5.00	4.84	N.S.
3. Appearance	4.38	5.10	N.S.	4.50	5.22	N.S.
4. Normalcy of Development	39.38	36.48	N.S.	38.00	36.06	N.S.
5. Dependency	20.12	24.00	2.12**	20.50	25.06	N.S.
6. Independency	27.25	26.39	N.S.	26.62	26.32	N.S.
7. Aggression	14.88	17.26	N.S.	14.25	16.26	N.S.
8. Guilt	20.75	19.68	N.S.	19.62	20.87	N.S.
9. Peer Interaction	22.62	27.00	2.52**	22.38	27.13	2.68**
10. Concept of Retardation	29.00	31.19	N.S.	26.25	32.00	2.24**
11. Abasement	24.50	26.45	N.S.	24.38	27.77	N.S.
12. Comprehension of Self/Others	14.00	18.03	2.51**	15.75	17.35	N.S.
13. Counteraction	23.75	24.03	N.S.	22.75	23.77	N.S.
14. Educational Implications and Training	24.00	25.19	N.S.	23.38	23.48	N.S.
15. Community Provision	15.12	16.87	N.S.	14.62	17.06	2.02**
16. Emotional-Social Behavior	23.88	27.68	N.S.	22.00	26.00	1.76*
17. Expression of Affection	18.88	19.10	N.S.	19.25	19.74	N.S.
18. Suppression of Sex	8.12	9.35	N.S.	9.00	8.48	N.S.
19. Encouraging Verbalization	18.62	17.48	N.S.	18.50	18.22	N.S.

TABLE 401

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON AMR SCORES[1] (CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I X	Y	t	ADMINISTRATION II X	Y	t
20. Excluding Outside Influences	9.50	11.06	N.S.	10.75	10.87	N.S.
21. Avoidance of Communication	9.50	10.22	N.S.	9.75	9.71	N.S.
22. Suppression of Aggression	10.62	11.19	N.S.	9.88	10.81	N.S.
23. Deification	11.50	12.77	N.S.	10.12	13.00	1.93*
24. Comradeship and Sharing	18.25	18.16	N.S.	18.75	18.45	N.S.
25. Strictness	12.75	13.06	N.S.	13.88	13.52	N.S.
26. Breaking the Will	8.00	10.39	1.72*	7.88	8.77	N.S.
27. Irritability	13.50	13.97	N.S.	13.00	14.74	N.S.
28. Autonomy of Child	17.50	17.84	N.S.	17.75	18.58	N.S.
29. Equalitarianism	15.88	17.00	N.S.	17.00	17.22	N.S.
30. Approval of Activity	14.00	12.29	N.S.	13.38	12.39	N.S.
31. Fostering Dependency	9.75	11.22	N.S.	10.62	11.87	N.S.
32. Acceleration of Development	11.75	11.29	N.S.	12.12	11.26	N.S.
33. Achievement	22.12	20.93	N.S.	23.12	20.39	N.S.

N = 8, 31
df = 37
***.01>2.704
**.05>2.021
*.10>1.684

[1] Unmatched t test

The areas that reflect divergence between the two groups are exclusively concerned with principles and practices in dealing with the retardate, primarily patterns of dependency and social development. This pattern is somewhat different from that on other comparisons, though the frequency of significance is relatively similar to the heterogeneity noted for the entire population of mothers in Question 3 (Tables 50-52).

On the contrast of final AMR scores, differences were found for categories 9 - Peer Interaction, 10 - Concept of Retardation and 15 - Community Provision at the .05 level, and 16 - Emotional-Social Behavior and 23 - Deification at the .10 level of significance. Again, no differences reached significance at the .01 level.

These changes represent a greater shift in specific significant categories from the pre-test than has been previously indicated for any of the groups which have been compared in this question. In only one instance, 9 - Peer Interaction, is variability continued in the same category over the entire time period. The other four indications of heterogeneity between the two female sub-groups reflect new areas of differentiation as well as the removal of divergence in three others. There is a slightly stronger tendency for the differences to appear in areas more concerned with the future of the retardate and with parental adjustment. It is conceivable that the counseling experiences of the clinic groups influence this pattern.

A somewhat similar pattern, though at greater levels of relative frequency, appears for the comparison between the Combined Clinic and the Control groups on these AMR items as that noted for the PARI comparison. Similar sex patterns are also observed. The males decrease in frequency of significant differences with both the counseling and the interim period, whereas the female sub-group exhibits somewhat more alteration on the second contrast both in frequency and in specific topic shift. Hence, counseling seems to influence specific attitudes toward retardation as well as general attitudes toward child-rearing practices.

D. Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC): Variable Scores

The initial t-test comparison of the Gradient Sentence Completion Variable scores between the Combined Clinic and the Control group (Table 402) yielded significant differences in the following variables: 5 - Affiliation, 14 - Identification, 20 - Omission, 33 - Supernaturalism and 34 - Understanding at the .01 level, and 3 - Acquiescence, 19 - Nurturance, 27 - Rejection and 30 - Sex at the .05 level. No differences at the .10 level were obtained.

TABLE 402

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1]

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Abasement	1.33	2.00	N.S.	1.33	1.94	N.S.
2. Achievement	18.73	18.02	N.S.	18.60	18.17	N.S.
3. Acquiescence	13.00	10.29	2.16**	15.00	13.19	N.S.
4. Acquisition	2.07	2.00	N.S.	2.40	2.06	N.S.
5. Affiliation	17.93	14.13	4.50***	18.60	14.07	4.21***
6. Aggression	3.20	3.71	N.S.	3.33	3.83	N.S.
7. Autonomy	1.73	1.36	N.S.	1.40	1.83	N.S.
8. Avoidance	1.93	1.35	N.S.	1.87	1.44	N.S.
9. Benignness	7.60	5.98	N.S.	7.47	6.31	4.11**
10. Counteraction	1.27	1.04	N.S.	.93	1.25	N.S.
11. Deference	2.00	2.27	N.S.	1.67	2.77	1.92*
12. Description	5.47	4.02	N.S.	6.13	5.40	N.S.

TABLE 402

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1]
(CONT)

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
13. Dominance	3.00	4.04	N.S.	2.47	3.73	N.S.
14. Identification	3.33	1.94	2.84***	3.27	2.52	N.S.
15. Integrity	2.93	2.71	N.S.	2.27	2.40	N.S.
16. Intellectualism	6.67	6.06	N.S.	7.40	6.00	N.S.
17. Irritability	3.20	3.54	N.S.	3.40	3.29	N.S.
18. Narcissism	.40	.40	N.S.	.60	.75	N.S.
19. Nurturance	9.53	11.36	2.29**	8.60	10.98	3.83***
20. Omission	3.66	7.42	8.20***	1.80	2.25	N.S.
21. Optimism	1.67	1.48	N.S.	1.87	1.19	2.16**
22. Order	2.07	1.88	N.S.	1.73	2.04	N.S.
23. Pessimism	.40	.29	N.S.	.13	.33	N.S.
24. Phobia	1.87	2.23	N.S.	1.80	2.08	N.S.
25. Play	3.00	2.86	N.S.	2.80	2.56	N.S.
26. Refusal	3.80	2.48	N.S.	4.27	3.44	N.S.
27. Rejection	5.80	8.19	2.56**	6.80	8.35	N.S.
28. Seclusion	1.00	.50	N.S.	.60	.56	N.S.
29. Sentience	11.07	11.12	N.S.	11.07	10.69	N.S.
30. Sex	.60	.19	2.41**	.27	.31	N.S.
31. Submissiveness	.47	.63	N.S.	.20	.42	N.S.
32. Succorance	3.00	3.25	N.S.	2.93	3.77	N.S.
33. Supernaturalism	1.33	3.04	2.71***	1.27	2.46	2.34**
34. Understanding	2.27	4.56	2.93***	2.07	4.27	2.73***
35. Unhappiness	1.67	2.00	N.S.	2.67	2.35	N.S.

N = 15, 52
df = 65
***.01>2.660
**.05>2.000
*.10>1.671

[1] Unmatched *t* test

These areas of significant variation reflect differentiation in need variables concerned with interpersonal relations of the individual as well as in the intellectual areas. In only one instance, 19 - Nurturance, do any of these variant categories coincide with those isolated for the full study population in Question 3 (Tables 53-57).

The follow-up comparison of the two groups on the same measure yielded significant variation for 5 - Affiliation, 9 - Benignness, 19 - Nurturance and 34 - Understanding at the .01 level, 21 - Optimism and 33 - Supernaturalism at the .05 level, and 11 - Deference at the .10 level.

Four of these seven categories represent a continuation of variability from the pre-test in the interactive and intellectually oriented areas. New patterns arise in three areas of a primarily personal adjustment nature while they disappear in variables such as 14 - Identification, 20 - Omission, 27 - Rejection, and 30 - Sex. The counseling experience seems to have diminished inter-group variation while at the same time adjusting the content focus of the heterogeneity toward a more self-oriented trend.

The male sub-group comparison (Table 403) reached significance in six of the 35 variable categories: 14 - Identification, 27 - Rejection and 34 - Understanding at the .05 level; and 4 - Acquisition, 5 - Affiliation and 30 - Sex at the .10 level. No significant differences were observed at the .01 level.

TABLE 403

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1]

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Abasement	1.28	1.95	N.S.	1.00	1.76	N.S.
2. Achievement	18.14	17.90	N.S.	18.57	18.90	N.S.
3. Acquiescence	12.43	10.76	N.S.	16.43	14.28	N.S.
4. Acquisition	1.14	2.57	1.78*	1.71	2.67	N.S.
5. Affiliation	17.14	13.38	1.76*	16.28	13.57	N.S.
6. Aggression	3.28	3.05	N.S.	3.28	3.38	N.S.
7. Autonomy	1.14	1.33	N.S.	1.00	1.48	N.S.
8. Avoidance	2.57	1.90	N.S.	3.28	1.76	N.S.
9. Benignness	9.00	5.62	N.S.	7.43	6.33	N.S.
10. Counteraction	1.28	1.38	N.S.	1.14	1.71	N.S.
11. Deference	2.28	2.14	N.S.	1.43	2.86	1.76*
12. Description	5.14	4.52	N.S.	7.71	4.95	1.73*
13. Dominance	3.57	4.57	N.S.	3.28	3.62	N.S.
14. Identification	3.71	2.10	2.24**	3.28	2.43	N.S.
15. Integrity	3.00	3.10	N.S.	1.86	2.48	N.S.
16. Intellectualism	7.28	6.&L	N.S.	6.86	6.90	N.S.
17. Irritability	3.71	3.76	N.S.	3.86	2.95	N.S.
18. Narcissism	.43	.43	N.S.	1.00	.38	1.87*
19. Nurturance	8.71	12.14	N.S.	7.86	11.57	N.S.
20. Omission	5.14	6.76	N.S.	1.86	2.38	N.S.
21. Optimism	1.43	1.62	N.S.	1.57	1.57	N.S.
22. Order	1.43	2.05	N.S.	1.57	1.81	N.S.
23. Pessimism	.00	.28	N.S.	.14	.19	N.S.
24. Phobia	1.86	2.28	N.S.	2.14	1.71	N.S.
25. Play	2.43	3.19	N.S.	2.57	3.14	N.S.
26. Refusal	4.71	2.57	N.S.	4.71	4.14	N.S.

TABLE 403

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1] (CONT)

	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
Category Variables	X	Y	t	X	Y	t
27. Rejection	4.57	7.57	2.25**	5.43	8.10	N.S.
28. Seclusion	.28	.24	N.S.	.57	.43	N.S.
29. Sentience	14.00	10.43	N.S.	13.43	9.95	N.S.
30. Sex	.86	.28	1.84*	.28	.38	N.S.
31. Submissiveness	.71	.62	N.S.	.14	.05	N.S.
32. Succorance	1.86	3.33	N.S.	2.71	3.14	N.S.
33. Supernaturalism	1.43	2.43	N.S.	.86	2.00	N.S.
34. Understanding	1.28	4.62	2.45**	1.00	3.81	2.93***
35. Unhappiness	1.71	1.38	N.S.	2.71	2.19	N.S.

N = 7,21
df = 26
***.01>2.779
**.05>2.056
*.10>1.706

[1] Unmatched t test

Here again, a pattern very similar to that for the total group is noted for this father segment. It also is more similar to the pattern of initial variability for the full study group presented in Question 3 (Tables 58-61) than for either sub-group on the instruments thus far considered.

On the second comparison, significance was noted at the .01 level in one instance 34 - Understanding, and in 11 - Deference, 12 - Description and 18 - Narcissism at the .10 level. No significant differences were apparent at the .05 level.

These findings represent minimal variation between the two sub-groups as well as a reduction in the frequency and criticalness of the differences observed. In only one instance, 34 - Understanding, does heterogeneity between the two groups appear at both periods for the same variable. There is some indication that emphasis at the second period is more personally directed than at the first. It would seem that the counseling experiences for the husbands have a tendency to minimize differentiation between the groups and to influence the focus on the more self-oriented areas.

The female sub-group (Table 404) initial comparison yielded significant variation at the .01 level for 33 - Supernaturalism, at the .05 level for 20 - Omission, and at the .10 level for 3 - Acquiescence, 4 - Acquisition, 12 - Description, 14 - Identification, 28 - Seclusion and 29 - Sentience.

TABLE 404

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND THE
COMBINED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON GSC
VARIABLE SCORES[1]

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	X	Y	t	X	Y	t
1. Abasement	1.38	2.03	N.S.	1.62	2.06	N.S.
2. Achievement	19.25	18.10	N.S.	18.62	17.68	N.S.
3. Acquiescence	13.50	9.97	1.86*	13.75	12.45	N.S.
4. Acquisition	2.88	1.61	1.97*	3.00	1.64	2.11**
5. Affiliation	18.62	14.64	N.S.	20.62	14.42	2.50**
6. Aggression	3.12	4.16	N.S.	3.38	4.13	N.S.
7. Autonomy	2.25	1.39	N.S.	1.75	2.06	N.S.
8. Avoidance	1.38	.97	N.S.	.62	1.22	N.S.
9. Benignness	6.38	6.22	N.S.	7.50	6.29	N.S.
10. Counteraction	1.25	.81	N.S.	.75	.94	N.S.
11. Deference	1.75	2.35	N.S.	1.88	2.71	N.S.
12. Description	5.75	3.68	1.99*	4.75	5.71	N.S.

TABLE 404

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1] (CONT)

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
13. Dominance	2.50	3.68	N.S.	1.75	3.81	2.08**
14. Identification	3.00	1.84	1.71*	3.25	2.58	N.S.
15. Integrity	2.88	2.45	N.S.	2.62	2.35	N.S.
16. Intellectualism	6.12	5.61	N.S.	7.88	5.39	1.85*
17. Irritability	2.75	3.39	N.S.	3.00	3.52	N.S.
18. Narcissism	.38	.39	N.S.	.25	1.00	N.S.
19. Nurturance	10.25	10.84	N.S.	9.25	10.58	N.S.
20. Omission	2.38	7.87	2.36**	1.75	2.16	N.S.
21. Optimism	1.88	1.39	N.S.	2.12	.94	4.00***
22. Order	2.62	1.77	N.S.	1.88	2.19	N.S.
23. Pessimism	.75	.29	N.S.	.12	.42	N.S.
24. Phobia	1.88	2.19	N.S.	1.50	2.06	N.S.
25. Play	3.50	2.64	N.S.	3.00	2.16	N.S.
26. Refusal	3.00	2.42	N.S.	3.88	2.97	N.S.
27. Rejection	6.88	8.61	N.S.	8.00	8.52	N.S.
28. Seclusion	1.62	.68	2.00*	.62	.64	N.S.
29. Sentience	8.50	11.58	1.90*	9.00	11.19	N.S.
30. Sex	.38	.13	N.S.	.25	.26	N.S.
31. Submissiveness	.25	.64	N.S.	.25	.68	N.S.
32. Succorance	4.00	3.19	N.S.	3.12	4.19	N.S.
33. Supernaturalism	1.25	3.45	2.88***	1.62	2.77	N.S.
34. Understanding	3.12	4.52	N.S.	3.00	4.58	N.S.
35. Unhappiness	1.62	2.42	N.S.	2.62	2.45	N.S.

N = 8,31
df = 37
***.01 > 2.704
**.05 > 2.021
*.10 > 1.684

[1] Unmatched t test

Only two of these eight variables also appear in the Question 3 initial contrast for the mothers in the study population (Tables 62-69). Here again, specific differences between the treatment and the non-treatment group seem to be unique for this comparison.

On the follow-up comparison, significant differences between females of the Combined Clinic and the Control group were found in the following: at the .01 level, 21 - Optimism; at the .05 level, 4 - Acquisition, 5 - Affiliation and 13 - Dominance; and at the .10 level, 16 - Intellectualism.

This second comparison represents a decrease in the occurrence of differences between the counseling treatment groups and the Control group. In addition, the carry over of significant variation is only observed in one instance, 4 - Acquisition, where the critical level actually increases. The other four significant variables represent new areas of specific divergence. The removal of significant variation in the other seven originally significant areas is also noted. While it is difficult to summarize the patterns reflected in these minimal occurrences, it would seem that differences between the mothers in the Clinic group and Control group tend to converge in areas somewhat more closely concerned with out-going aspects of behavior than was previously observed.

On the comparisons of GSC Variables, the total group, as well as both father and mother sub-groups tend to reflect a decrease in the number of areas of variation on the second comparison. In perusing the dynamic patterns, the differentiation between counseling treatment and no treatment indicates little change in the total groups and male sub-groups while the mothers show a greater shift in area of divergence.

E. Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC): Direction Scores

The initial comparison for Gradient Sentence Completion Test Direction Score variation between the Combined Clinic and the Control group (Table 405) yielded significant differences at the .01 level for both the 2 - Negative and 3 - Neutral Direction scores. Differences did not appear at the .05 or the .10 level for the 1 - Positive category. The lack of any Neutral score assignations for the Control group definitely contributed to the discrepancies obtained in that area.

TABLE 405

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND THE
COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON GSC
DIRECTION SCORES[1]

	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
Categories	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Positive	84.87	84.60	N.S.	89.00	86.27	3.00***
2. Negative	89.00	85.96	3.03***	52.47	55.00	1.87*
3. Neutral	.00	86.27	63.35***	7.53	7.69	N.S.

N = 15, 52
df = 65
***.01>2.660
**.05>2.000
*.10>1.671

[1] Unmatched t test

On the post-test, significance at the .01 level was obtained for the 1 - Positive Direction category, and at the .10 level for the 2 - Negative designation. Differences were not obtained for the 3 - Neutral category at this point.

These findings do not essentially mirror the trends noted on the pre-test. These gross measures reflect a trend for final differences between the two groups to center in the assignation of positive scores to the expressed need variables. This is in contrast to the previous major differentiation noted in the 2 - Negative and 3 - Neutral areas.

The comparison of the father GSC Direction scores (Table 406) showed significant initial differentiation for the 3 - Neutral category at the .01 level. No differences at the .05 or the .10 levels were obtained. Here again, the lack of assignation of any Neutral scores by the Control group is a primary factor in the determination of the results.

TABLE 406

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND THE
COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON GSC
DIRECTION SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Positive	87.43	86.62	N.S.	90.86	89.28	N.S.
2. Negative	90.86	88.28	N.S.	48.86	52.48	N.S.
3. Neutral	.00	89.28	34.35***	9.28	7.24	N.S.

N = 7,21
df = 26
***.01> 2.779
**.05> 2.056
*.10> 1.706

[1] Unmatched t test

On the post-test, no significant differences were obtained. The counseling treatment seems to have influenced the diminution of variation between the husbands of the two comparison groups.

A similar picture to that of the male sub-group was found on the female comparison of GSC Direction scores (Table 407). On the pre-test, significant variation at the .01 level was again observed for the 3 - Neutral designation. No differences at the .05 or .10 levels were obtained. This one area of variation disappeared on the second comparison and was not supplanted by any other significant patterns of variation.

TABLE 407

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON GSC DIRECTION SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Positive	82.62	83.22	N.S.	87.38	84.22	N.S.
2. Negative	87.37	84.39	N.S.	55.62	56.71	N.S.
3. Neutral	.00	84.22	53.58***	6.00	8.00	N.S.

N = 8,21
df = 37
***.01>2.704
**.05>2.021
*.10>1.684

[1] Unmatched *t* test

The general trend on the comparison of the gross GSC Direction scores for the Control and the Combined Clinics is toward a diminution of variation from the pre-test to the final test period. This is evidenced by a more positive orientation and a shift away from Negative and Neutral responses.

F. Stern Activities Index (SAI)

Initial differences on SAI scores (Table 408) are noted for four of the [illegible] categories: [illegible] - Counteraction, [illegible] - Emotionality, and [illegible] Placidity at the .05 level; and 8 - Abasement at the .10 level. No differences at the .01 level were observed.

TABLE 408

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON SAI SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Sentience	3.53	3.19	N.S.	3.40	3.31	N.S.
2. Sex	3.33	3.27	N.S.	2.93	3.02	N.S.
3. Change	6.13	6.27	N.S.	6.27	6.46	N.S.
4. Play	5.07	4.60	N.S.	4.33	4.86	N.S.
5. Energy	6.20	5.77	N.S.	6.27	5.71	N.S.
6. Pragmatism	6.93	7.36	N.S.	6.60	7.21	N.S.
7. Adaptiveness	4.07	3.65	N.S.	4.60	3.23	2.55**
8. Abasement	4.40	3.60	1.94*	4.00	3.71	N.S.
9. Deference	7.47	6.83	N.S.	7.33	6.77	N.S.
10. Order	4.73	5.83	N.S.	4.53	5.81	N.S.
11. Harmavoidance	7.13	7.58	N.S.	6.67	7.29	N.S.
12. Understanding	5.27	5.31	N.S.	5.73	5.35	N.S.
13. Counteraction	7.07	5.81	2.14**	7.07	5.83	2.04**
14. Achievement	4.80	5.13	N.S.	5.93	5.08	N.S.
15. Reflectiveness	5.73	5.71	N.S.	5.87	5.71	N.S.
16. Humanism	5.67	5.36	N.S.	5.60	4.75	N.S.
17. Scientism	4.20	4.02	N.S.	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
18. Objectivity	7.33	6.98	N.S.	6.93	6.77	N.S.
19. Affiliation	7.20	6.90	N.S.	7.40	6.52	N.S.
20. Nurturance	8.20	7.94	N.S.	8.47	7.56	N.S.
21. Succorance	7.60	7.19	N.S.	7.87	7.15	N.S.
22. Conjunctivity	6.40	6.13	N.S.	7.07	5.60	2.92***
23. Aggression	2.20	2.15	N.S.	2.53	2.19	N.S.
24. Dominance	4.00	3.50	N.S.	4.20	3.75	N.S.
25. Narcissism	4.80	5.46	N.S.	4.73	5.48	N.S.
26. Fantasied Achievement	4.47	5.54	N.S.	5.40	5.38	N.S.

TABLE 408

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON SAI SCORES[1] (CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I $\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t	ADMINISTRATION II $\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
27. Ego Achievement	4.13	4.02	N.S.	4.67	4.50	N.S.
28. Exhibitionism	2.87	3.36	N.S.	2.80	3.96	1.73*
29. Impulsion	4.80	4.40	N.S.	5.00	4.62	N.S.
30. Emotionality	4.20	3.02	2.28**	4.13	3.40	N.S.
31. Prudery	6.67	6.73	N.S.	7.07	6.98	N.S.
32. Sameness	3.87	3.73	N.S.	3.73	3.54	N.S.
33. Passivity	3.80	4.42	N.S.	3.73	4.29	N.S.
34. Rejection	2.27	2.50	N.S.	2.47	2.85	N.S.
35. Autonomy	2.40	2.92	N.S.	2.13	2.85	N.S.
36. Disjunctivity	3.60	3.86	N.S.	2.93	4.40	2.92**
37. Blameavoidance	7.80	7.84	N.S.	7.47	7.81	N.S.
38. Infavoidance	4.87	5.42	N.S.	5.20	5.19	N.S.
39. Deliberation	5.20	5.60	N.S.	5.00	5.38	N.S.
40. Placidity	5.80	6.98	2.28**	5.87	6.67	N.S.

N = 15,52
df = 65
[illegible]
**.05>2.000
*.10>1.671

[1] Unmatched t test

This indicates minimal inter-group divergence on the need variables explored by the Stern Activities Index. The significant variability observed is centered around topics relating to self-maintenance and emotional excitability. None of the four areas exhibiting significant divergence is also noted as among the six showing initial variability in Question 3 (Tables 70-75).

Here again, the specific differences between the two groups observed here seem to be unique with this contrast of the Combined Clinics and the Control groups.

On the follow-up comparison, significant variation was obtained for variables 22 - Conjunctivity and 36 - Disjunctivity at the .01 level; 7 - Adaptiveness and 13 - Counteraction at the .05 level; and 28 - Exhibitionism at the .10 level.

This represents a slight increase in variability between the two groups at the end of the project. Differentiation noted on the first battery is maintained in only one instance, 13 - Counteraction. All other differences represent new patterns of heterogeneity. The primary content theme of the final divergence is centered upon adjustment patterns of the individual to situations and other individuals.

The t-test comparison of the male sub-group on SAI scores (Table 409) yielded initial significant variation in five of the 40 variable categories: 30 - Emotionality and 40 - Placidity at the .05 level; and 1 - Sentience, 6 - Pragmatism and 26 - Fantasied Achievement at the .10 level. No differences were obtained at the .01 level.

TABLE 409

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON SAI SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Sentience	3.86	2.81	1.73*	3.86	3.00	N.S.
2. Sex	3.57	3.38	N.S.	3.14	3.38	N.S.
3. Change	5.28	6.19	N.S.	5.43	6.67	1.96*
4. Play	4.71	4.24	N.S.	3.43	4.19	N.S.
5. Energy	5.28	6.38	N.S.	6.14	6.19	N.S.
6. Pragmatism	6.43	7.86	1.86*	6.28	7.24	N.S.
7. Adaptiveness	3.86	3.57	N.S.	5.43	3.43	2.57**
8. Abasement	4.28	3.33	N.S.	3.86	3.90	N.S.
9. Deference	7.86	6.57	N.S.	6.86	6.48	N.S.
10. Order	4.57	4.90	N.S.	4.71	4.81	N.S.
11. Harmavoidance	6.43	6.48	N.S.	5.71	5.48	N.S.
12. Understanding	5.71	5.81	N.S.	5.86	5.38	N.S.
13. Counteraction	7.00	6.71	N.S.	7.43	6.67	N.S.
14. Achievement	4.43	6.14	N.S.	6.14	5.90	N.S.
15. Reflectiveness	5.57	5.76	N.S.	5.71	5.38	N.S.
16. Humanism	5.00	6.05	N.S.	5.86	4.24	N.S.
17. Scientism	4.71	5.76	N.S.	6.00	5.62	N.S.
18. Objectivity	7.86	7.24	N.S.	7.14	6.71	N.S.
19. Affiliation	7.57	7.81	N.S.	6.71	6.14	N.S.
20. Nurturance	7.57	7.81	N.S.	7.86	6.81	N.S.
21. Succorance	7.86	7.00	N.S.	7.71	6.86	N.S.
22. Conjunctivity	6.28	6.48	N.S.	7.14	5.67	1.86*
23. Aggression	2.71	2.67	N.S.	2.86	2.76	N.S.
24. Dominance	4.57	4.24	N.S.	4.00	4.43	N.S.
25. Narcissism	4.43	5.43	N.S.	4.28	5.10	N.S.
26. Fantasied Achievement	4.14	6.05	2.03*	5.71	5.81	N.S.

TABLE 409

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON SAI SCORES[1]

(CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
27. Ego Achievement	3.28	3.86	N.S.	4.43	4.81	N.S.
28. Exhibitionism	3.00	3.76	N.S.	3.14	4.81	N.S.
29. Impulsion	4.14	4.33	N.S.	4.14	4.62	N.S.
30. Emotionality	4.00	2.43	2.06**	3.86	2.76	N.S.
31. Prudery	6.43	6.62	N.S.	6.86	6.62	N.S.
32. Sameness	4.71	3.81	N.S.	4.57	3.33	1.96*
33. Passivity	4.71	4.10	N.S.	3.86	3.81	N.S.
34. Rejection	2.86	2.57	N.S.	3.43	3.38	N.S.
35. Autonomy	2.14	3.28	N.S.	2.28	3.14	N.S.
36. Disjunctivity	3.71	3.52	N.S.	2.86	4.33	1.86*
37. Blameavoidance	7.28	7.33	N.S.	7.14	7.24	N.S.
38. Infavoidance	4.71	4.76	N.S.	4.86	4.38	N.S.
39. Deliberation	5.86	5.67	N.S.	5.86	5.38	N.S.
40. Placidity	6.00	7.57	2.06**	6.14	7.24	N.S.

N = 7,21
df = 26
***.01>2.779
**.05>2.056
*.10>1.706

[1] Unmatched t test

This occurrence of differences between the two groups suggests that they are relatively homogeneous on the need variables measured by the SAI. In addition, none parallel intra-study population initial variation noted in Question 3 (Tables 76-82). The areas displaying divergence are somewhat similar to those noted for the previous comparison of the total groups.

On the second comparison, significant differences between the males were again obtained for five SAI category variables: 7 - Adaptiveness at the .05 level; and 3 - Change, 22 - Conjunctivity, 32 - Sameness and 36 - Disjunctivity at the .10 level. Again no differences were observed at the .01 level of significance.

None of these areas of variability coincide with categories displaying variation on the pre-test comparison. Thus the counseling treatment seems to have influenced a minor shift in areas of specific manifestation of differences between the Control and the Combined Clinic fathers. The areas exhibiting final variability are somewhat more specifically related to the personal adaptive patterns of the subjects in contrast to the more diffuse manifestations of achievement, personal goals and gratification.

The comparison of SAI scores between the Control and the Combined Clinic group mothers (Table 410) also yielded minimal differences. Significance at the .01 level was not derived for any of the 40 category variables. Category 13 - Counteraction reached significance at the .05 level, and 5 - Energy, 10 - Order and 33 - Passivity did so at the .10 level. These differences present a rather diffuse pattern of existing variation.

TABLE 410

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON SAI SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Sentience	3.25	3.45	N.S.	3.00	3.52	N.S.
2. Sex	3.12	3.19	N.S.	2.75	2.77	N.S.
3. Change	6.88	6.32	N.S.	7.00	6.32	N.S.
4. Play	5.38	4.84	N.S.	5.12	5.32	N.S.
5. Energy	7.00	5.35	1.85*	6.38	5.39	N.S.
6. Pragmatism	7.38	7.03	N.S.	6.88	7.19	N.S.
7. Adaptiveness	4.25	3.71	N.S.	3.88	3.10	N.S.
8. Abasement	4.50	3.77	N.S.	4.12	3.58	N.S.
9. Deference	7.12	7.00	N.S.	7.75	6.97	N.S.
10. Order	4.88	6.45	1.69*	4.38	6.48	2.12**
11. Harmavoidance	7.75	8.32	N.S.	7.50	8.52	N.S.
12. Understanding	4.88	4.97	N.S.	5.62	5.32	N.S.
13. Counteraction	7.12	5.19	2.60**	6.75	5.26	1.82*
14. Achievement	5.12	4.45	N.S.	5.75	4.52	N.S.
15. Reflectiveness	5.88	5.68	N.S.	6.00	5.94	N.S.
16. Humanism	6.25	4.90	N.S.	5.38	5.10	N.S.
17. Scientism	3.75	2.84	N.S.	3.75	2.61	N.S.
18. Objectivity	6.88	6.81	N.S.	6.75	6.81	N.S.
19. Affiliation	7.88	6.87	N.S.	8.00	6.77	N.S.
20. Nurturance	8.75	8.03	N.S.	9.00	8.06	N.S.
21. Succorance	7.38	7.32	N.S.	8.00	7.35	N.S.
22. Conjunctivity	6.50	5.90	N.S.	7.00	5.55	2.16**
23. Aggression	1.75	1.81	N.S.	2.25	1.81	N.S.
24. Dominance	3.50	3.00	N.S.	4.38	3.29	N.S.
5. Narcissism	5.12	5.48	N.S.	5.00	5.74	N.S.

TABLE 410

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTROL AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON SAI SCORES[1] (CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	X	Y	t	X	Y	t
26. Fantasied Achievement	4.75	5.19	N.S.	5.12	5.10	N.S.
27. Ego Achievement	4.88	4.13	N.S.	4.88	4.29	N.S.
28. Exhibitionism	2.75	3.10	N.S.	2.50	3.39	N.S.
29. Impulsion	5.38	4.45	N.S.	5.75	4.61	N.S.
30. Emotionality	4.38	3.42	N.S.	4.38	3.84	N.S.
31. Prudery	6.88	6.81	N.S.	7.25	7.22	N.S.
32. Sameness	3.12	3.68	N.S.	3.00	3.68	N.S.
33. Passivity	3.00	4.64	1.85*	3.62	4.61	N.S.
34. Rejection	1.75	2.45	N.S.	1.62	2.48	N.S.
35. Autonomy	2.62	2.68	N.S.	2.00	2.64	N.S.
36. Disjunctivity	3.50	4.10	N.S.	3.00	4.45	2.16**
37. Blameavoidance	8.25	8.19	N.S.	7.75	8.19	N.S.
38. Infavoidance	5.00	5.87	N.S.	5.50	5.74	N.S.
39. Deliberation	4.62	5.55	N.S.	4.25	5.39	N.S.
40. Placidity	5.62	6.58	N.S.	5.62	6.29	N.S.

N = 8,31
df = 37
***.01> 2.704
**.05> 2.021
*.10> 1.684

[1] Unmatched t test

The follow-up comparison of the two female groups on SAI scores yielded significant differences again in four of the 40 variables: 10 - Order, 22 - Conjunctivity and 36 - Disjunctivity at the .05 level; and 13 - Counteraction at the .10 level. No differences were obtained for the .01 level of significance.

These results reflect a negligible pattern of heterogeneity between the female segment of the Combined Clinic and the Control groups. They do, however, display a shift in the focus of variation from the initial diffuse pattern to one with primary emphasis upon the adaptiveness of the individual. None of the categories which display variability on the first test comparison maintain significance on the second. The female sub-group tends to maintain a relatively minimal level of significance on SAI need personality variables. However, a shift from the generalized content pattern to one more specifically related to areas of self-orientation and control is coincident with the counseling treatment.

The t-test comparison of the scores for the Control group and the Combined Clinic group, both for the initial and the final testing period, yields significant heterogeneity beyond chance between the two groups on the various measures. Patterns of alteration are similarly noted in most instances between the two comparison periods. On the DRQ, AMR, and GSC, a decrease in differences between these two groups takes place over the period following Test I during which the Clinic groups received one of the four counseling treatments while the Control population was exposed to no contact whatsoever. In light of the generally low incidence of initial variability found in Question 3 and the specicalized counseling treatment given the Combined Clinic group, an opposite trend toward greater heterogeneity might have been expected. This occurs for the PARI and SAI scores at a negligible ratio. Thus, a trend toward quantitative homogeneity is predominant. It should be recalled, however, that the patterns of differences observed on the initial comparison generally do not coincide with those of initial variability for the project population in Question 3. Different trends indicative of unique divergence seem to be frequently present on attitudes relevant to child-rearing practices, retardation, and on aspects of personal adjustment.

Since the length of the time interval could not be equated for the Control group, no contrast of the scores obtained for the Clinic groups immediately after the termination of counseling was performed. It is possible that the general decrease in intra-clinic group variability during the post-counseling period (noted in Questions 5 and 6) is also a factor influencing the frequency patterns noted on the second comparison here. The fact that the Control population had been exposed to the instrument items on the pre-test may also have had a residual effect on attitude alteration during the time prior to the second test administration.

QUESTION 9. WHAT DIFFERENCES EXIST IN ATTITUDES AND NEED PERSONALITY STRUCTURE BETWEEN PARENTS IN A GROUP WHO COMPLETE COUNSELING AND THOSE WHO DROP OUT IN LESS THAN THREE COUNSELING PERIODS (EXPERIMENTAL VERSUS CLINIC DROPOUT)?

In order to delve into the reasons for the dropout behavior of a small segment of the clinic population, an unmatched t test comparison of the initial scores on each of the instruments was performed between the Combined Clinic and the Clinic Dropout populations.

A. Discomfort Relief Quotient (DRQ)

Statistically significant variation between the Clinic Dropout and the Combined Clinic group (Table 411) was derived for interview categories: 1 - Intra-Family and 3 - Activity-Goals at the .01 level; 2 - Neighborhood at the .05 level; and 4 - Community at the .10 level of significance. This indicates the presence of significant qualitative and quantitative differences between these two groups on these gross scores.

TABLE 411

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLINIC DROPOUT
AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP
ON DRQ SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Intra-Family	56.25	49.85	8.03***
2. Neighborhood	47.42	50.63	2.14**
3. Activity-Goals	56.42	48.27	6.02***
4. Community	70.00	68.23	1.93*
5. Parental Relationships	45.67	45.77	N.S.

N = 12,52
df = 62
***.01 > 2.660
**.05 > 2.000
*.10 > 1.670

[1] Unmatched *t* test

The comparison between the fathers (Table 412) of both groups yielded indications of significant variation for interview categories: 1 - Intra-Family and 3 - Activity-Goals at the .01 level; and 5 - Parental Relationships at the .05 confidence limits. No trends were evident at the .10 level.

TABLE 412

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLINIC DROPOUT
AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS
ON IBQ SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Intra-Family	57.50	42.38	3.15***
2. Neighborhood	44.50	43.00	N.S.
3. Activity-Goals	74.00	38.57	5.76***
4. Community	74.25	64.57	N.S.
5. Parental Relationships	52.75	39.00	2.06**

N = 4,21
df = 23
***.01 > 2.807
**.05 > 2.069
*.10 > 1.714

[1] Unmatched t test

Similarly the t test analysis between the female components of the two groups (Table 413) yielded statistically significant t's for: 5 - Parental Relationships at the .01 level; and 2 - Neighborhood, 3 - Activity-Goals, and 4 - Community at the .05 level of significance. No further significant differences at the .10 level were obtained.

TABLE 413

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLINIC DROPOUT AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON DRQ SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Intra-Family	55.62	54.90	N.S.
2. Neighborhood	48.88	55.81	2.48**
3. Activity-Goals	47.62	54.84	2.55**
4. Community	67.88	70.71	2.60**
5. Parental Relationships	42.12	50.35	4.61***

N = 8,31
df = 37
***.01 > 2.714
**.05 > 2.028
*.10 > 1.688

[1] Unmatched _t_ test

All three of these comparisons of the initial DRQ scores for the Clinic Dropout and the Combined Clinic group have resulted in an outstanding display of inter-group variability. These consistent findings on this admittedly gross measure suggest the existence of some basic differences in familial organization and adjustment in the two groups prior to the initiation of the counseling experience for any of the subjects.

B. Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI)

The t test comparison of the pre-counseling PARI scores (Table 414) indicated statistically significant variation between the Combined Clinic and the Clinic Dropout populations on eight of the 19 categories: 10 - Suppression of Aggression and 18 - Autonomy of Child at the .01 level; 1 - Encouraging Verbalization, 4 - Breaking the Will, 11 - Equalitarianism, 12 - Avoidance of Communication and 14 - Suppression of Sexuality at the .05 level; and 16 - Comradeship and Sharing at the .10 level of significance.

TABLE 414

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLINIC DROPOUT AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON PARI SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Encouraging Verbalization	14.17	17.00	2.36**
2. Fostering Dependency	12.17	10.46	N.S.
3. Seclusiveness	12.33	10.83	N.S.
4. Breaking the Will	12.83	10.62	2.21**
5. Marital Conflict	13.83	14.75	N.S.
6. Strictness	13.33	13.46	N.S.
7. Irritability	13.50	13.73	N.S.
8. Excluding Outside Influences	12.42	11.42	N.S.
9. Deification of Parent	13.25	12.77	N.S.
10. Suppression of Aggression	12.83	10.58	2.76***
11. Equalitarianism	14.42	16.56	2.07**
12. Avoidance of Communication	12.67	10.60	2.09**
13. Inconsiderateness	13.17	12.10	N.S.
14. Suppression of Sexuality	12.00	9.52	2.65**
15. Ascendancy	12.17	11.15	N.S.
16. Comradeship and Sharing	15.08	17.56	1.99*
17. Expression of Affection	15.42	17.02	N.S.
18. Autonomy of Child	14.75	17.73	2.70***
19. Achievement	20.25	22.10	N.S.

N = 12,52
df = 37
***.01 > 2.714
**.05 > 2.028
*.10 > 1.688

[1] Unmatched *t* test

This occurrence suggests the existence of real differences between the two groups in attitudes relating to children and child-rearing practices. The topics displaying major variability seem to center around practices relevant to the parental control of childrens' behavior.

The male sub-group comparison (Table 415) provided significant divergence on 14 of the 30 categories; 4 - Breaking the Will, 10 - Suppression of Aggression, 14 - Suppression of Sexuality, 16 - Comradeship and Sharing and 26 Complaint of Ascendancy of Wife at the .01 level; 12 - Avoidance of Communication, 20 - Harsh Punishment, 21 - Deception, 24 - Irresponsibility of the Father, 25 - Avoidance of Expression of Affection and 27 - Suppression of Affection at the .05 level; and 1 - Encouraging Verbalization, 11 - Equalitarianism, 15 - Ascendancy and 18 - Autonomy of the Child at the .10 level of significance.

TABLE 415

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLINIC DROPOUT
AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS
ON PARI SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Encouraging Verbalization	12.50	16.28	1.92*
2. Fostering Dependency	11.00	10.86	N.S.
3. Seclusiveness	12.00	10.24	N.S.
4. Breaking the Will	15.75	10.81	2.98***
5. Marital Conflict	14.75	14.48	N.S.
6. Strictness	14.00	12.86	N.S.
7. Irritability	13.75	12.67	N.S.
8. Excluding Outside Influences	12.25	11.28	N.S.
9. Deification of Parent	11.75	12.28	N.S.
10. Suppression of Aggression	13.25	9.81	2.86***

TABLE 415

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLINIC DROPOUT AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON PARI SCORES[1]

(CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
11. Equalitarianism	13.75	16.71	1.75*
12. Avoidance of Communication	13.50	10.43	2.09**
13. Inconsiderateness	15.00	12.28	N.S.
14. Suppression of Sexuality	13.25	9.81	2.83***
15. Ascendancy	13.50	10.43	1.76*
16. Comradeship and Sharing	11.50	17.24	3.11***
17. Expression of Affection	12.25	14.62	N.S.
18. Autonomy of Child	13.50	16.81	1.72*
19. Achievement	21.50	22.33	N.S.
20. Harsh Punishment	14.75	10.76	2.70**
21. Deception	13.50	9.95	2.11**
22. Non-punishment	9.75	9.10	N.S.
23. Demanding Activity	13.25	12.67	N.S.
24. Irresponsibility of Father	14.50	10.38	2.74**
25. Avoidance of Expression of Affection	13.75	10.52	2.68**
26. Complaint of Ascendancy of Wife	15.00	10.71	2.99***
27. Suppression of Affection	14.75	11.67	2.08**
28. Change Orientation	12.50	12.24	N.S.
29. Forcing Independence	13.50	12.38	N.S.
30. Past Orientation	12.75	12.24	N.S.

N = 4,21
df = 23
***.01> 2.807
**.05> 2.069
*.10> 1.714

[1] Unmatched t test

As in the preceding total group comparison, the bulk of the variation between the two groups is concentrated in aspects of parental control of children's behavior. In addition, items related to the degree of assertiveness between parents indicates divergent patterns between the two groups. Similar patterns and frequency of heterogeneity between the Combined Clinic and the Clinic Dropout group is observed for the father sub-group as was found for the total group.

The unmatched t test comparison of the mothers from the two groups on PARI scores (Table 416) resulted in a much less predominant manifestation of significant variation. No differences reached statistical significance at the .01 level; 18 - Autonomy of the Child and 20 - Martyrdom were significant at the .05 level; and 2 - Fostering Dependency indicated minimal criticalness at the .10 level.

TABLE 416

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLINIC DROPOUT
AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS
ON PARI SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	X	Y	t
1. Encouraging Verbalization	15.00	17.48	N.S.
2. Fostering Dependency	12.75	10.19	1.76*
3. Seclusiveness	12.50	11.22	N.S.
4. Breaking the Will	11.38	10.48	N.S.
5. Marital Conflict	13.38	14.94	N.S.
6. Strictness	13.00	13.87	N.S.
7. Irritability	13.38	14.45	N.S.
8. Excluding Outside Influences	12.50	11.52	N.S.
9. Deification of Parent	14.00	13.10	N.S.
10. Suppression of Aggression	12.62	11.10	N.S.
11. Equalitarianism	14.75	16.45	N.S.

TABLE 416

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLINIC DROPOUT AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON PARI SCORES[1] (CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	X	Y	t
12. Avoidance of Communication	12.25	10.71	N.S.
13. Inconsiderateness	12.25	11.97	N.S.
14. Suppression of Sexuality	11.38	9.32	N.S.
15. Ascendancy	11.50	11.64	N.S.
16. Comradeship and Sharing	16.88	17.77	N.S.
17. Expression of Affection	17.00	18.64	N.S.
18. Autonomy of Child	15.38	18.35	2.24**
19. Achievement	19.62	21.94	N.S.
20. Martyrdom	12.38	9.13	2.36**
21. Fear of Harming the Baby	13.62	13.22	N.S.
22. Rejection of the Homemaking Role	11.75	11.06	N.S.
23. Approval of Activity	13.38	13.26	N.S.
24. Intrusiveness	12.88	10.52	N.S.
25. Acceleration of Development	12.75	11.71	N.S.
26. Dependency of the Mother	13.75	12.35	N.S.

N = 8,31
df = 37
***.01> 2.714
**.05> 2.069
*.10> 1.714

[1] Unmatched t test

This occurrence presents quite a different pattern from that observed for the females on DRQ scores or for the results in this question for either the total group or the male sub-group. It would seem that the mothers included in the Clinic Dropout and the Combined Clinic groups are initially essentially the same in terms of their expressed attitudes toward children and child-rearing practices as they are measured by the PARI. The three topics which reflect minimal divergence are concerned with parental control and self-involvement, aspects noted as the general focus for the total group as well as for the father sub-group.

It seems that basic patterns of initial differences exist in the expressed attitudes toward children and child-rearing practices between the Clinic Dropout and the Combined Clinic group when they are contrasted as total entities and when the father segment is considered independently. These patterns are not sustained on the female sub-group comparison. A relatively homogeneous pattern seems to be present for this sub-group on the variables which were considered. It can be concluded from the data that significant differences obtained between the Clinic Dropout and Combined Clinic groups may be attributable to differences between the fathers. These differences in reaction toward child-rearing practices may precipitate the dropout behavior.

C. Attitude Scale Toward Mental Retardation (AMR)

The t test analysis of the differences in attitudes relevant to retardation as measured by the AMR (Table 417) yielded no significant differences at any of the criterion levels for the Combined Clinic versus the Clinic Dropout group comparison. This indicates a degree of homogeneity between these two groups on the topics containing a specific reference to retardation.

TABLE 417

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLINIC DROPOUT AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON AMR SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		t
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	
1. Sexuality	11.00	9.92	N.S.
2. Genetic Responsibility	4.67	4.69	N.S.
3. Appearance	5.25	5.02	N.S.
4. Normalcy of Development	37.92	36.40	N.S.
5. Dependency	24.67	23.15	N.S.
6. Independency	25.58	26.54	N.S.
7. Aggression	17.00	16.71	N.S.
8. Guilt	20.33	20.13	N.S.
9. Peer Interaction	27.92	26.44	N.S.
10. Concept of Retardation	29.85	30.38	N.S.
11. Abasement	27.58	26.04	N.S.
12. Comprehension of Self/Others	16.50	17.36	N.S.
13. Counteraction	24.33	24.00	N.S.
14. Educational Implications and Training	25.67	24.83	N.S.
15. Community Provision	17.42	17.04	N.S.
16. Emotional-Social Behavior	27.58	27.42	N.S.
17. Expression of Affection	17.67	18.71	N.S.
18. Suppression of Sex	9.58	9.15	N.S.
19. Encouraging Verbalization	17.00	17.25	N.S.
20. Excluding Outside Influences	12.50	10.81	N.S.
21. Avoidance of Communication	10.75	10.06	N.S.
22. Suppression of Aggression	12.25	10.77	N.S.
23. Deification	14.58	13.04	N.S.

TABLE 417

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLINIC DROPOUT AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON AMR SCORES[1]

(CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
24. Comradeship and Sharing	18.50	17.79	N.S.
25. Strictness	12.50	12.69	N.S.
26. Breaking the Will	10.83	9.94	N.S.
27. Irritability	13.42	13.54	N.S.
28. Autonomy of Child	16.67	17.42	N.S.
29. Equalitarianism	16.50	16.79	N.S.
30. Approval of Activity	13.50	12.19	N.S.
31. Fostering Dependency	13.00	11.46	N.S.
32. Acceleration of Development	12.17	11.65	N.S.
33. Achievement	21.33	21.15	N.S.

N = 12,52
df = 62
***.01>2.660
**.05>2.000
*.10>1.670

[1] Unmatched t test

When the father subjects were contrasted on AMR scores (Table 418), significant variation was obtained in eight of the 33 categories; 5 - Dependency at the .01 level; 9 - Peer Interaction, 20 - Excluding Outside Influences, 26 - Breaking the Will, and 27 - Irritability at the .05 level; and 14 - Educational Implications and Treatment, 17 - Expression of Affection and 24 - Comradeship and Sharing at the .10 level.

TABLE 418

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLINIC DROPOUT AND THE COMBINED GROUP FATHERS ON AMR SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I $\bar{X}$	 $\bar{Y}$	 t
1. Sexuality	11.50	9.95	N.S.
2. Genetic Responsibility	4.25	4.52	N.S.
3. Appearance	5.25	4.90	N.S.
4. Normalcy of Development	33.00	36.28	N.S.
5. Dependency	28.50	21.90	3.34***
6. Independency	25.25	26.76	N.S.
7. Aggression	17.25	15.90	N.S.
8. Guilt	19.75	20.81	N.S.
9. Peer Interaction	29.50	25.62	2.63**
10. Concept of Retardation	30.50	29.24	N.S.
11. Abasement	29.50	25.43	N.S.
12. Comprehension of Self/Others	17.00	16.38	N.S.
13. Counteraction	23.50	23.95	N.S.
14. Educational Implications and Training	27.75	24.28	2.02*
15. Community Provision	18.50	17.28	N.S.
16. Emotional-Social Behavior	32.00	27.05	N.S.
17. Expression of Affection	15.75	18.14	2.05*
18. Suppression of Sex	8.25	8.86	N.S.
19. Encouraging Verbalization	17.50	16.90	N.S.
20. Excluding Outside Influences	14.50	10.43	2.61**
21. Avoidance of Communication	11.75	9.81	N.S.
22. Suppression of Aggression	12.75	10.14	N.S.
23. Deification	14.25	13.43	N.S.
24. Comradeship and Sharing	19.00	17.24	1.83*

TABLE 418

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLINIC DROPOUT AND THE COMBINED GROUP FATHERS ON AMR SCORES[1]

(CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
25. Strictness	13.00	12.14	N.S.
26. Breaking the Will	12.75	9.28	2.15**
27. Irritability	16.25	12.90	2.40**
28. Autonomy of Child	17.75	16.81	N.S.
29. Equalitarianism	16.50	16.43	N.S.
30. Approval of Activity	15.00	12.05	N.S.
31. Fostering Dependency	13.00	11.81	N.S.
32. Acceleration of Development	12.00	12.19	N.S.
33. Achievement	23.00	21.48	N.S.

N = 4,21
df = 23
***.01> 2.807
**.05> 2.069
*.10> 1.714

[1] Unmatched t test

While only one of these variables reaches significance at the .01 level, the divergence for this sub-group is sufficient to suggest patterns of differences between the male participants who continue in counseling and those who terminate attendance before the completion of the series. The topics exhibiting variability of fairly divergent content focus: social and emotional development, dependence-independence, control and future planning for the retardate.

The analysis of AMR scores for the female sub-group (Table 419) yielded an indication of significant variation in only one category, 28 - Autonomy of the Child at the .05 level. The mother segment thus shows a pattern of negligible variation on expressed attitudes toward retardation as measured by the AMR scales.

TABLE 419

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLINIC DROPOUT AND THE COMBINED GROUP MOTHERS ON AMR SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Sexuality	10.75	9.90	N.S.
2. Genetic Responsibility	4.88	4.88	N.S.
3. Appearance	5.25	5.10	N.S.
4. Normalcy of Development	40.38	36.48	N.S.
5. Dependency	22.75	24.00	N.S.
6. Independency	25.75	26.38	N.S.
7. Aggression	16.88	17.26	N.S.
8. Guilt	20.62	19.68	N.S.
9. Peer Interaction	27.12	27.00	N.S.
10. Concept of Retardation	29.62	31.19	N.S.
11. Abasement	26.62	26.45	N.S.
12. Comprehension of Self/Others	16.25	18.03	N.S.
13. Counteraction	24.75	24.03	N.S.
14. Educational Implications and Training	24.62	25.19	N.S.
15. Community Provision	16.88	16.87	N.S.
16. Emotional-Social Behavior	25.38	27.68	N.S.
17. Expression of Affection	18.62	19.10	N.S.
18. Suppression of Sex	10.25	9.35	N.S.
19. Encouraging Verbalization	16.75	17.48	N.S.
20. Excluding Outside Influences	11.50	11.06	N.S.
21. Avoidance of Communication	10.25	10.22	N.S.
22. Suppression of Aggression	12.00	11.19	N.S.

TABLE 419

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLINIC DROPOUT AND THE COMBINED GROUP MOTHERS ON AMR SCORES[1] (CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	X	Y	t
23. Deification	14.75	12.77	N.S.
24. Comradeship and Sharing	18.25	18.16	N.S.
25. Strictness	12.25	13.06	N.S.
26. Breaking the Will	9.88	10.39	N.S.
27. Irritability	12.00	13.97	N.S.
28. Autonomy of Child	16.12	17.84	2.06**
29. Equalitarianism	16.50	17.00	N.S.
30. Approval of Activity	12.75	12.29	N.S.
31. Fostering Dependency	13.00	11.22	N.S.
32. Acceleration of Development	12.25	11.29	N.S.
33. Achievement	20.50	20.94	N.S.

N = 8,31
df = 37
***.01> 2.714
**.05> 2.028
*.10> 1.688

[1] Unmatched t test

The pattern of negligible differences displayed by the total group and the female sub-group comparison provides no clues as to precipitating factors relevant to attitudes toward retardation differentiating between those who continue and those who discontinue counseling. The comparison of the fathers provides a somewhat greater pattern of initial diversity between the two groups in a number of topic areas.

D. Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC): Variable Scores

The unmatched t test comparison of the Gradient Sentence Completion Test Variable scores of the Clinic Dropout and the Combined Clinic group (Table 420) produced statistically significant patterns of variability in seven of the 40 category variables: 2 - Achievement and 20 - Omission at the .01 level; 28 - Seclusion and 31 - Submissiveness at the .05 level; and 10 - Counteraction, 24 - Phobia and 26 - Refusal at the .10 level of significance.

TABLE 420

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLINIC DROPOUT
AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON GSC
VARIABLE SCORES[1]

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I $\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Abasement	1.50	2.00	N.S.
2. Achievement	13.17	18.02	3.04***
3. Acquiescence	12.83	10.29	N.S.
4. Acquisition	1.83	2.00	N.S.
5. Affiliation	15.25	14.13	N.S.
6. Aggression	3.17	3.71	N.S.
7. Autonomy	1.33	1.36	N.S.
8. Avoidance	1.50	1.35	N.S.
9. Benignness	4.42	5.98	N.S.
10. Counteraction	.83	1.04	N.S.
11. Deference	1.42	2.27	1.80*
12. Description	4.92	4.02	N.S.
13. Dominance	2.58	4.04	N.S.
14. Identification	1.92	1.94	N.S.
15. Integrity	1.83	2.71	N.S.
16. Intellectual	6.25	6.06	N.S.
17. Irritability	3.08	3.54	N.S.
18. Narcissism	.50	.40	N.S.

TABLE 420

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLINIC DROPOUT AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1]

(CONT)

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I		
	X	Y	t
19. Nurturance	12.75	11.36	N.S.
20. Omission	15.67	7.42	6.58***
21. Optimism	1.25	1.48	N.S.
22. Order	2.00	1.88	N.S.
23. Pessimism	.08	.29	N.S.
24. Phobia	1.33	2.23	1.92*
25. Play	3.67	2.86	N.S.
26. Refusal	4.58	2.48	1.88*
27. Rejection	7.83	8.19	N.S.
28. Seclusion	1.08	.50	2.33**
29. Sentience	9.58	11.12	N.S.
30. Sex	.17	.19	N.S.
31. Submissiveness	.17	.63	2.11**
32. Succorance	2.33	3.25	N.S.
33. Supernatural	2.33	3.04	N.S.
34. Understanding	4.25	4.56	N.S.

N = 12,52
df = 62
***.01 > 2.660
**.05 > 2.000
*.10 > 1.670

[1] Unmatched t test

Here again, the need personality variables reflecting divergence between the two groups are rather diffusely distributed in terms of their dynamic content. The personally related topics of withdrawal, fear and yielding, are primarily represented by the majority of the significant variation with the exception of expressions of the achievement need. These personality trait tendencies may have relevance in the determination of the maintenance of counseling participation.

The husband sub-group comparison on GSC Variable scores (Table 421) yielded significant variation at the .01 level for variable 28 - Seclusion; and at the .10 level for 3 - Acquiescence, 11 - Deference and 26 - Refusal. No differences at the .05 level were observed.

TABLE 421

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLINIC DROPOUT
AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS
ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1]

	ADMINISTRATION I		
Category Variables	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Abasement	1.50	1.95	N.S.
2. Achievement	15.25	18.24	N.S.
3. Acquiescence	14.75	10.76	1.84*
4. Acquisition	1.50	2.57	N.S.
5. Affiliation	14.00	13.38	N.S.
6. Aggression	2.50	3.05	N.S.
7. Autonomy	1.25	1.33	N.S.
8. Avoidance	1.50	1.90	N.S.
9. Benignness	3.00	5.62	N.S.
10. Counteraction	.75	1.38	N.S.
11. Deference	.75	2.14	1.95*
12. Description	7.75	4.52	N.S.
13. Dominance	2.65	4.57	N.S.
14. Identification	2.00	2.10	N.S.
15. Integrity	2.00	3.10	N.S.
16. Intellectual	7.00	6.71	N.S.
17. Irritability	4.00	3.76	N.S.
18. Narcissism	.25	.43	N.S.
19. Nurturance	13.75	12.14	N.S.
20. Omission	7.50	6.76	N.S.

TABLE 421

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLINIC DROPOUT AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON THE GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1] (CONT)

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
21. Optimism	.75	1.62	N.S.
22. Order	2.25	2.05	N.S.
23. Pessimism	.25	.28	N.S.
24. Phobia	1.25	2.28	N.S.
25. Play	4.25	3.19	N.S.
26. Refusal	6.50	2.57	1.84*
27. Rejection	9.00	7.57	N.S.
28. Seclusion	1.25	.24	3.04***
29. Sentience	9.50	10.43	N.S.
30. Sex	.50	.28	N.S.
31. Submissiveness	.50	.62	N.S.
32. Succorance	1.75	3.33	N.S.
33. Supernatural	4.00	2.43	N.S.
34. Understanding	2.25	4.62	N.S.

N = 4,21
df = 23
***.01>2.807
**.05>2.069
*.10>1.714

[1] Unmatched t test

This minimal occurrence of significant variation reflects a similar pattern of dynamic emphasis to that noted for the preceding total group. Existing differences are primarily clustered in topic areas relevant to withdrawal, avoidance and yielding behavior patterns.

The wife sub-group comparison (Table 422) also obtained significant diversity on four of the 40 variables: 2 - Achievement and 20 - Omission at the .01 level; and 31 - Submissiveness and 33 - Supernaturalism at the .05 level. No further indices of variation at the .10 level were obtained.

TABLE 422

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLINIC DROPOUT AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1]

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Abasement	1.50	2.03	N.S.
2. Achievement	12.12	17.87	2.80***
3. Acquiescence	11.88	9.97	N.S.
4. Acquisition	2.00	1.61	N.S.
5. Affiliation	15.88	14.64	N.S.
6. Aggression	3.50	4.16	N.S.
7. Autonomy	1.38	1.39	N.S.
8. Avoidance	1.50	.97	N.S.
9. Benignness	5.12	6.22	N.S.
10. Counteraction	.88	.81	N.S.
11. Deference	1.75	2.35	N.S.
12. Description	3.50	3.68	N.S.
13. Dominance	2.50	3.68	N.S.
14. Identification	1.88	1.84	N.S.
15. Integrity	1.75	2.45	N.S.
16. Intellectual	5.88	5.61	N.S.
17. Irritability	2.62	3.39	N.S.
18. Narcissism	.62	.39	N.S.
19. Nurturance	12.25	10.34	N.S.
20. Omission	19.75	7.87	3.88***
21. Optimism	1.50	1.39	N.S.

TABLE 422

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLINIC DROPOUT
AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS
ON THE GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1]
(CONT)

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I		
	X	Y	t
22. Order	1.88	1.77	N.S.
23. Pessimism	0	.29	N.S.
24. Phobia	1.38	2.19	N.S.
25. Play	3.38	2.64	N.S.
26. Refusal	3.62	2.42	N.S.
27. Rejection	7.25	8.61	N.S.
28. Seclusion	1.00	.68	N.S.
29. Sentience	9.62	11.58	N.S.
30. Sex	0	.13	N.S.
31. Submissiveness	0	.64	2.55**
32. Succorance	2.62	3.19	N.S.
33. Supernaturalism	1.50	3.45	2.55**
34. Understanding	5.25	4.25	N.S.
35. Unhappiness	1.75	2.42	N.S.

N = 8,31
df = 37
***.01 > 2.714
**.05 > 2.028
*.10 > 1.688

[1] Unmatched _t_ test

Here the minimal variation obtained is more diffuse than that noted for the fathers in that 2 - Achievement and 33 - Supernaturalism appear as significant in addition to the heterogeneity found in the dynamic personality areas of withdrawal and avoidance. This pattern is quite similar to the findings of the total group comparison.

A relatively consistent pattern seems to emerge on this comparison of GSC need personality variables between the Clinic Dropout and the Combined Clinic groups. Variables dynamically related to ascendancy, avoidance and withdrawal seem to consistently reflect inter-group differentiation. These could very conceivably bear a relationship to the determination of dropout behavior.

E. Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC): Direction Scores

Significant variation on the t test comparison of the GSC Direction scores between the Clinic Dropout and the Combined Clinic group (Table 423) was observed for all three direction designations, 1 - Positive, 2 - Negative, and 3 - Neutral at the .01 level of significance. This indicates maximal variation between the two groups on the direction orientation associated with the category variable responses.

TABLE 423

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLINIC DROPOUT
AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON
GSC DIRECTION SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Positive	81.67	84.60	5.68***
2. Negative	48.33	85.96	39.77***
3. Neutral	19.00	86.27	42.19***

N = 12,52
df = 62
***.01 > 2.660
**.05 > 2.000
*.10 > 1.670

[1] Unmatched t test

The contrast of the two groups on GSC Direction scores for the husband sub-group (Table 424) provided a t score attaining significance at the .01 level for the 2 - Negative and 3 - Neutral directions. No significant variability was obtained for the 1 - Positive category.

TABLE 424

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLINIC DROPOUT AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON GSC. DIRECTION SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I $\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Positive	80.50	86.62	N.S.
2. Negative	54.25	88.28	7.36***
3. Neutral	14.25	89.28	19.39***

N = 4,21
df = 23
***.01> 2.807
**.05> 2.069
*.10> 1.714

[1] Unmatched t test

The wife sub-group comparison (Table 425) yielded significant variation at the .01 level for the same two direction categories, 2 - Negative and 3 - Neutral. No significant variation for the 1 - Positive category was observed.

TABLE 425

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLINIC DROPOUT AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON GSC. DIRECTION SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I $\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Positive	82.25	83.22	N.S.
2. Negative	45.38	84.39	24.21***
3. Neutral	21.38	84.22	39.20***

N = 8,31
df = 37
***.01> 2.714
**.05> 2.028
*.10> 1.688

[1] Unmatched t test

It seems that direction orientation relevant to the need personality variables measured by the GSC shows inter-group variation quite consistently. This is a reflection of the tone of the orientation of the individuals in these need areas. This pattern indicates divergence of orientation which could influence counseling participation. For both the husband and wife comparisons, only the 2 - Negative and 3 - Neutral categories reflect heterogeneity. In both these instances the mean scores for the Clinic Dropout group are considerably lower than those of the Combined Clinics. The Dropout group, on these two individual comparisons, seems to have expressed fewer negative or neutrally oriented needs than the Combined group.

F. Stern Activities Index (SAI)

The comparison of the initial test scores on the SAI between the Clinic Dropout and the Combined Clinic group (Table 426) yielded t-scores reaching significance in only two of the 40 category variables, 18 - Objectivity at the .05 level and 4 - Play at the .10 level. No differences at the .01 level were determined. This variation appears in the rather dichotomous areas of personality dynamics, 4 - Play and 18 - Objectivity.

TABLE 426

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLINIC DROPOUT AND
THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON SAI SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Sentience	3.25	3.19	N.S.
2. Sex	2.92	3.27	N.S.
3. Change	5.67	6.27	N.S.
4. Play	5.50	4.60	1.68*
5. Energy	5.67	5.77	N.S.
6. Pragmatism	7.42	7.36	N.S.
7. Adaptiveness	3.33	3.65	N.S.
8. Abasement	4.00	3.60	N.S.

TABLE 426

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLINIC DROPOUT AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON SAI SCORES[1] (CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
9. Deference	6.83	6.83	N.S.
10. Order	6.58	5.83	N.S.
11. Harmavoidance	7.67	7.58	N.S.
12. Understanding	5.33	5.31	N.S.
13. Counteraction	5.83	5.81	N.S.
14. Achievement	4.17	5.13	N.S.
15. Reflectiveness	5.58	5.71	N.S.
16. Humanism	6.42	5.36	N.S.
17. Scientism	4.92	4.02	N.S.
18. Objectivity	5.50	6.98	2.05**
19. Affiliation	6.00	6.90	N.S.
20. Nurturance	8.58	7.94	N.S.
21. Succorance	7.58	7.19	N.S.
22. Conjunctivity	5.92	6.13	N.S.
23. Aggression	1.58	2.15	N.S.
24. Dominance	2.83	3.50	N.S.
25. Narcissism	5.08	5.46	N.S.
26. Fantasied Achievement	5.17	5.54	N.S.
27. Ego Achievement	3.42	4.02	N.S.
28. Exhibitionism	2.42	3.36	N.S.
29. Impulsion	3.50	4.40	N.S.
30. Emotionality	2.58	3.02	N.S.
31. Prudery	7.08	6.73	N.S.
32. Sameness	4.33	3.73	N.S.
33. Passivity	4.33	4.42	N.S.
34. Rejection	2.75	2.50	N.S.
35. Autonomy	2.42	2.92	N.S.

TABLE 426

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLINIC DROPOUT AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON SAI SCORES[1] (CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
36. Disjunctivity	4.08	3.86	N.S.
37. Blameavoidance	8.42	7.85	N.S.
38. Infavoidance	5.83	5.42	N.S.
39. Deliberation	6.50	5.60	N.S.
40. Placidity	7.42	6.98	N.S.

N = 12,52
df = 62
***.01 > 2.660
**.05 > 2.000
*.10 > 1.670

[1] Unmatched t test

The analysis of the father sub-group (Table 427) provided indices of significant variation in four of the SAI need categories: 4 - Play and 19 - Affiliation at the .05 level; and 18 - Objectivity and 34 - Rejection at the .10 level of significance. Here again, no differences reaching significance at the .01 level were derived. These areas of variability between the two groups again include the play-objectivity dichotomy as well as the more interpersonal variables of 19 - Affiliation and 34 - Rejection.

TABLE 427

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLINIC DROPOUT AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON SAI SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	X	Y	t
1. Sentience	2.75	2.81	N.S.
2. Sex	3.00	3.38	N.S.
3. Change	5.50	6.19	N.S.
4. Play	6.25	4.24	2.08**
5. Energy	6.25	6.38	N.S.
6. Pragmatism	8.50	7.86	N.S.
7. Adaptiveness	3.75	3.57	N.S.
8. Abasement	4.00	3.33	N.S.
9. Deference	6.75	6.57	N.S.
10. Order	3.75	4.90	N.S.
11. Harmavoidance	6.25	6.48	N.S.
12. Understanding	5.75	5.81	N.S.
13. Counteraction	6.50	6.71	N.S.
14. Achievement	5.75	6.14	N.S.
15. Reflectiveness	5.00	5.76	N.S.
16. Humanism	4.75	6.05	N.S.
17. Scientism	7.25	5.76	N.S.
18. Objectivity	5.00	7.24	1.86*
19. Affiliation	4.25	6.95	2.19**
20. Nurturance	7.50	7.81	N.S.
21. Succorance	6.75	7.00	N.S.
22. Conjunctivity	5.50	6.48	N.S.
23. Aggression	1.75	2.67	N.S.
24. Dominance	3.00	4.24	N.S.
25. Narcissism	5.00	5.43	N.S.
26. Fantasied Achievement	6.25	6.05	N.S.

TABLE 427

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLINIC DROPOUT AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON SAI SCORES[1]

(CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
27. Ego Achievement	5.00	3.86	N.S.
28. Exhibitionism	3.00	3.76	N.S.
29. Impulsion	4.25	4.33	N.S.
30. Emotionality	3.00	2.43	N.S.
31. Prudery	7.00	6.62	N.S.
32. Sameness	4.50	3.81	N.S.
33. Passivity	3.75	4.10	N.S.
34. Rejection	4.25	2.57	2.05*
35. Autonomy	3.25	3.28	N.S.
36. Disjunctivity	4.50	3.52	N.S.
37. Blameavoidance	8.25	7.33	N.S.
38. Infavoidance	5.25	4.76	N.S.
39. Deliberation	5.75	5.67	N.S.
40. Placidity	7.00	7.57	N.S.

N = 4, 21
df = 23
***.01 > 2.807
**.05 > 2.069
*.10 > 1.714

[1] Unmatched t test

The mother comparison (Table 428) also yielded significant t scores in four of the need categories; 16 - Humanism at the .05 level and 10 - Order, 20 - Nurturance and 27 - Ego Achievement at the .10 level. No differences at the .01 level were observed.

TABLE 428

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLINIC DROPOUT AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON SAI SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Sentience	3.50	3.45	N.S.
2. Sex	2.88	3.19	N.S.
3. Change	5.75	6.32	N.S.
4. Play	5.12	4.84	N.S.
5. Energy	5.38	5.35	N.S.
6. Pragmatism	6.88	7.03	N.S.
7. Adaptiveness	3.12	3.71	N.S.
8. Abasement	4.00	3.77	N.S.
9. Deference	6.88	7.00	N.S.
10. Order	8.00	6.45	1.95*
11. Harmavoidance	8.38	8.32	N.S.
12. Understanding	5.12	4.97	N.S.
13. Counteraction	5.50	5.19	N.S.
14. Achievement	3.38	4.45	N.S.
15. Reflectiveness	5.88	5.68	N.S.
16. Humanism	7.25	4.90	2.60**
17. Scientism	3.75	2.84	N.S.
18. Objectivity	5.75	6.81	N.S.
19. Affiliation	6.88	6.87	N.S.
20. Nurturance	9.12	8.03	1.79*
21. Succorance	8.00	7.32	N.S.
22. Conjunctivity	6.12	5.90	N.S.
23. Aggression	1.50	1.81	N.S.
24. Dominance	2.75	3.00	N.S.
25. Narcissism	5.12	5.48	N.S.
26. Fantasied Achievement	4.62	5.19	N.S.

TABLE 428

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CLINIC DROPOUT AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON . SAI SCORES[1] (CONT)

	ADMINISTRATION I		
Categories	X̄	Ȳ	t
27. Ego Achievement	2.62	4.13	1.78*
28. Exhibitionism	2.12	3.10	N.S.
29. Impulsion	3.12	4.45	N.S.
30. Emotionality	2.38	3.42	N.S.
31. Prudery	7.12	6.81	N.S.
32. Sameness	4.25	3.68	N.S.
33. Passivity	4.62	4.64	N.S.
34. Rejection	2.00	2.45	N.S.
35. Autonomy	2.00	2.68	N.S.
36. Disjunctivity	3.88	4.10	N.S.
37. Blameavoidance	8.50	8.19	N.S.
38. Infavoidance	6.12	5.87	N.S.
39. Deliberation	6.88	5.55	N.S.
40. Placidity	7.62	6.58	N.S.

N = 8,31
df = 37
***.01> 2.714
**.05> 2.028
*.10> 1.688

[1] Unmatched t test

This occurrence is similar to that of the total group and the male subgroup in frequency but presents a somewhat different complex of variation in terms of the dynamic areas reflecting divergence. No one pattern can be summarized since significance encompasses the more objectively oriented areas of 10 - Order and 27 - Ego Achievement as well as the more subjective 20 - Nurturance and 16 - Humanism.

The incidence of significant variation between the Clinic Dropout and the Combined Clinic Group on the basis of expressed need variables measured by the SAI is generally within the limits of chance variation. Patterns of divergence observed on the GSC and other instruments do not seem to be maintained on these comparisons. Little additional insight into the differences affecting the continuation or discontinuation of counseling is provided by this analysis of the SAI Scores.

For the most part, some trends are evident in this t test comparison of all initial instrument category scores for the Clinic Dropout and the Combined Clinic groups. The greatest incidence of variability seems to exist on the attitudes toward children and child-rearing practices of the PARI and the personality need variables and the direction scores of the GSC. A tendency for divergence on topics relevant to ascendancy, dominance and control is observed on both these instruments. These factors may have been contributory facets in the dropout behavior of a minority (12) of the initial clinic population.

QUESTION 10. WHAT DIFFERENCES EXIST IN ATTITUDES AND NEED PERSONALITY STRUCTURE BETWEEN PARENTS WHO TAKE AN INITIAL TEST BUT DO NOT ENTER COUNSELING (ATTRITION) AND THOSE WHO CONTINUE IN COUNSELING (EXPERIMENTAL)

An unmatched t-test was applied to the data for the pre-test scores of the Attrition and the Combined Clinic groups in an attempt to identify differences which may have been influential in the decision by the Attrition group not to begin the counseling program after having completed the first test battery.

A. Discomfort Relief Quotient (DRQ)

Statistically significant t-scores at the .01 level were obtained in four of the five interview categories on the comparison of the Discomfort-Relief total scores for the two groups: 2 - Neighborhood, 3 - Activity - Goals, 4 - Community and 5 - Parental Relationships (Table 429). No statistical variation was obtained at the .05 or the .10 levels. This occurrence of inter-group variability on these initial measures relevant to familial adjustment suggests differences between individuals who complete counseling and those who do not.

TABLE 429

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND
THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON
DRQ SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	X	Y	t
1. Intra-Family	48.33	49.85	N.S.
2. Neighborhood	33.00	50.63	8.44***
3. Activity-Goals	39.33	48.27	9.78***
4. Community	79.17	68.23	8.17***
5. Parental Relationships	56.83	45.77	6.15***

N = 6,52
df = 56
***.01 > 2.670
**.05 > 2.005
*.10 > 1.670

[1] Unmatched *t* test

A similar analysis performed on the husbands (Table 430) yielded significant variation at the .01 level for category 1 - Intra-Family and 5 - Parental Relationships, and at the .05 level for 4 - Community. No differences at the .10 level were observed. This is a slightly less pronounced indication of divergence than that found for the total group although it too is considerably greater than chance expectancy.

TABLE 430

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON IRQ SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Intra-Family	78.67	42.38	8.42***
2. Neighborhood	50.67	43.00	N.S.
3. Activity-Goals	43.67	38.57	N.S.
4. Community	81.00	64.57	2.16**
5. Parental Relationships	97.00	39.00	7.02***

N = 3,21
df = 22
***.01> 2.819
**.05> 2.074
*.10> 1.717

[1] Unmatched t test

The wife sub-groups (Table 431) yielded statistically significant variation on all five of the interview categories: 1 - Intra-Family, 2 - Neighborhood, 3 - Activity-Goals and 5 - Parental Relationships at the .01 level; and 4 - Community at the .05 level. Here again, this high occurrence of heterogeneity between the two groups suggests the existence of basic areas of difference on aspects of familial adjustment patterns between those who complete a counseling experience and those who indicate that they will participate but do not.

TABLE 431

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND
THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON
IRQ SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I $\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Intra-Family	18.00	54.90	14.00***
2. Neighborhood	15.33	55.81	18.46***
3. Activity-Goals	35.00	54.84	8.27***
4. Community	77.33	70.71	2.26**
5. Parental Relationships	16.67	50.35	11.73***

N = 3, 31
df = 32
***.01> 2.2740
**.05> 2.040
*.10> 1.695

[1] Unmatched t test

B. Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI)

No statistically significant differences at any of the three criterion levels were isolated by the unmatched t-test analysis of the PARI categories relating to aspects of child-rearing practices and parental adaptation for the Attrition and Combined Clinic groups for the total group (Table 432).

TABLE 432

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND
THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON
PARI SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I $\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Encouraging Verbalization	16.50	17.00	N.S.
2. Fostering Dependency	10.67	10.46	N.S.
3. Seclusiveness	10.83	10.83	N.S.
4. Breaking the Will	11.17	10.62	N.S.

TABLE 432

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON PARI SCORES[1] (CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I X̄	Ȳ	t
5. Marital Conflict	15.33	14.75	N.S.
6. Strictness	14.50	13.46	N.S.
7. Irritability	15.00	13.73	N.S.
8. Excluding Outside Influences	11.33	11.42	N.S.
9. Deification of Parent	11.67	12.77	N.S.
10. Suppression of Aggression	10.50	10.58	N.S.
11. Equalitarianism	15.83	16.56	N.S.
12. Avoidance of Communication	10.67	10.60	N.S.
13. Inconsiderateness	12.67	12.10	N.S.
14. Suppression of Sexuality	9.17	9.52	N.S.
15. Ascendancy	13.33	11.15	N.S.
16. Comradeship and Sharing	16.50	17.56	N.S.
17. Expression of Affection	17.00	17.02	N.S.
18. Autonomy of Child	17.00	17.73	N.S.
19. Achievement	23.33	22.10	N.S.

N = 6,52
df = 56
***.01>2.670
**.05>2.005
*.10>1.670

[1] Unmatched *t* test

One indication of divergence occurred for the father comparison in Category 26 - Complaint of Ascendancy of Wife (Table 433) at the .10 level. No significant differences were obtained at the .05 and .01 levels.

TABLE 433

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON PARI SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Encouraging Verbalization	14.00	16.28	N.S.
2. Fostering Dependency	12.67	10.86	N.S.
3. Seclusiveness	12.33	10.24	N.S.
4. Breaking the Will	11.67	10.81	N.S.
5. Marital Conflict	14.00	14.48	N.S.
6. Strictness	14.67	12.86	N.S.
7. Irritability	15.00	12.67	N.S.
8. Excluding Outside Influences	14.00	11.28	N.S.
9. Deification of Parent	13.67	12.28	N.S.
10. Suppression of Aggression	11.33	9.81	N.S.
11. Equalitarianism	15.00	16.71	N.S.
12. Avoidance of Communication	12.00	10.43	N.S.
13. Inconsiderateness	13.67	12.28	N.S.
14. Suppression of Sexuality	10.67	9.81	N.S.
15. Ascendancy	13.67	10.43	N.S.
16. Comradeship and Sharing	15.33	17.24	N.S.
17. Expression of Affection	15.00	14.62	N.S.
18. Autonomy of Child	14.33	16.81	N.S.
19. Achievement	24.67	22.33	N.S.
20. Harsh Punishment	12.33	10.76	N.S.
21. Deception	11.00	9.95	N.S.
22. Non-punishment	11.00	9.10	N.S.
23. Demanding Activity	15.67	12.67	N.S.
24. Irresponsibility	12.33	10.38	N.S.
25. Avoidance of Expression of Affection	12.33	10.52	N.S.

TABLE 433

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON PARI SCORES[1]

(CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
26. Complaint of Ascendancy of Wife	14.00	10.71	2.02*
27. Suppression of Affection	13.67	11.67	N.S.
28. Change Orientation	11.67	12.29	N.S.
29. Forcing Independence	13.33	12.38	N.S.
30. Past Orientation	13.33	12.24	N.S.

N = 3,21
df = 22
***.01>2.819
**.05>2.074
*.10>1.717

[1] Unmatched t test

The comparison between the mothers (Table 434) displayed no significant variation for any of the PARI categories at any of the levels indicated.

TABLE 434

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON PARI SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Encouraging Verbalization	19.00	17.48	N.S.
2. Fostering Dependency	8.67	10.19	N.S.
3. Seclusiveness	9.33	11.22	N.S.
4. Breaking the Will	10.67	10.48	N.S.
5. Marital Conflict	16.67	14.94	N.S.
6. Strictness	14.33	13.87	N.S.
7. Irritability	15.00	14.45	N.S.

TABLE 434
COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON PARI SCORES[1] (CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	X	Y	t
8. Excluding Outside Influences	8.67	11.52	N.S.
9. Deification of Parent	9.67	13.10	N.S.
10. Suppression of Aggression	9.67	11.10	N.S.
11. Equalitarianism	16.67	16.45	N.S.
12. Avoidance of Communication	9.33	10.71	N.S.
13. Inconsiderateness	11.67	11.97	N.S.
14. Suppression of Sexuality	7.67	9.32	N.S.
15. Ascendancy	13.00	11.64	N.S.
16. Comradeship and Sharing	17.67	17.77	N.S.
17. Expression of Affection	19.00	18.64	N.S.
18. Autonomy of Child	19.67	18.35	N.S.
19. Achievement	22.00	21.94	N.S.
20. Martyrdom	7.00	9.13	N.S.
21. Fear of Harming the Baby	10.67	13.22	N.S.
22. Rejection of the Homemaking Role	11.33	11.06	N.S.
23. Approval of Activity	14.33	13.26	N.S.
24. Intrusiveness	8.33	10.52	N.S.
25. Acceleration of Development	10.33	11.71	N.S.
26. Dependency of the Mother	9.33	12.35	N.S.

N = 3,31
df = 32
***.01>2.740
**.05>2.040
*.10>1.695

[1] Unmatched *t* test

These generally negative findings suggest that no initial differences on attitudes toward children and child-rearing practices exist between the Combined Clinic population and the Attrition group. Differences which may contribute to a differentiation of behavior between these groups do not seem to lie in this dynamic area.

C. Attitude Scale Toward Mental Retardation (AMR)

The comparison of the Attrition and the Combined Clinic group (Table 435) on initial attitudes toward retardation as measured by the AMR showed significant differences in five of the 33 categories: 11 - Abasement at the .01 level; 4 - Normalcy of Development and 16 - Emotional-Social Behavior at the .05 level; and 10 - Concept of Retardation and 21 - Avoidance of Communication at the .10 level. These occurrences indicate minimal variation between these two groups in terms of their concept of retardation and the handling of the retardate.

TABLE 435

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON AMR SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	X	Y	t
1. Sexuality	9.67	9.92	N.S.
2. Genetic Responsibility	4.67	4.69	N.S.
3. Appearance	4.17	5.02	N.S.
4. Normalcy of Development	39.50	36.40	2.29**
5. Dependency	22.00	23.15	N.S.
6. Independency	26.17	26.54	N.S.
7. Aggression	14.67	16.71	N.S.
8. Guilt	18.83	20.13	N.S.
9. Peer Interaction	24.33	26.44	N.S.
10. Concept of Retardation	28.67	30.38	1.96*
11. Abasement	24.00	26.04	2.75***

TABLE 435
COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON AMR SCORES[1]
(CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
12. Comprehension of Self/Others	16.33	17.36	N.S.
13. Counteraction	22.83	24.00	N.S.
14. Educational Implications and Training	24.83	24.83	N.S.
15. Community Provision	17.00	17.04	N.S.
16. Emotional-Social Behavior	25.00	27.42	2.11**
17. Expression of Affection	18.33	18.71	N.S.
18. Suppression of Sex	9.67	9.15	N.S.
19. Encouraging Verbalization	17.17	17.25	N.S.
20. Excluding Outside Influences	11.17	10.81	N.S.
21. Avoidance of Communication	12.17	10.06	1.79*
22. Suppression of Aggression	9.67	10.77	N.S.
23. Deification	12.33	13.04	N.S.
24. Comradeship and Sharing	18.00	17.79	N.S.
25. Strictness	12.33	12.69	N.S.
26. Breaking the Will	9.17	9.94	N.S.
27. Irritability	13.17	13.54	N.S.
28. Autonomy of Child	18.00	17.42	N.S.
29. Equalitarianism	15.33	16.77	N.S.
30. Approval of Activity	14.50	12.19	N.S.

TABLE 435

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON AMR SCORES[1] (CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
31. Fostering Dependency	11.83	11.46	N.S.
32. Acceleration of Development	11.50	11.65	N.S.
33. Achievement	22.00	21.15	N.S.

N = 6,52
df = 56
***.01>2.670
**.05>2.005
*.10>1.673

[1] Unmatched t test

On the male sub-group comparison (Table 436), statistically significant differences were observed for three of the categories: 20 - Excluding Outside Influences and 21 - Avoidance of Communication at the .05 level; and 30 - Approval of Activity at the .10 level. Significant differences at the .01 level were not attained.

TABLE 436

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON AMR SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Sexuality	10.00	9.95	N.S.
2. Genetic Responsibility	5.33	4.52	N.S.
3. Appearance	4.33	4.90	N.S.
4. Normalcy of Development	38.33	36.28	N.S.
5. Dependency	23.67	21.90	N.S.

TABLE 436

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON AMR SCORES[1]

(CONT)

	ADMINISTRATION I		
Categories	X	Y	t
6. Independency	26.00	26.76	N.S.
7. Aggression	17.00	15.90	N.S.
8. Guilt	19.33	20.81	N.S.
9. Peer Interaction	26.67	25.62	N.S.
10. Concept of Retardation	27.67	29.24	N.S.
11. Abasement	24.67	25.43	N.S.
12. Comprehension of Self/Others	18.00	16.38	N.S.
13. Counteraction	21.00	23.95	N.S.
14. Educational Implications and Training	27.33	24.28	N.S.
15. Community Provision	18.00	17.28	N.S.
16. Emotional-Social Behavior	28.00	27.05	N.S.
17. Expression of Affection	17.67	18.14	N.S.
18. Suppression of Sex	11.00	8.86	N.S.
19. Encouraging Verbalization	15.67	16.90	N.S.
20. Excluding Outside Influences	14.00	10.43	2.16**
21. Avoidance of Communication	13.33	9.81	2.33**
22. Suppression of Aggression	10.67	10.14	N.S.
23. Deification	15.67	13.43	N.S.
24. Comradeship and Sharing	17.00	17.24	N.S.
25. Strictness	11.00	12.14	N.S.
26. Breaking the Will	9.00	9.28	N.S.
27. Irritability	13.33	12.90	N.S.
28. Autonomy of Child	17.67	16.81	N.S.

TABLE 436

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON AMR SCORES[1]
(CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I $\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
29. Equalitarianism	14.33	16.43	N.S.
30. Approval of Activity	16.00	12.05	1.72*
31. Fostering Dependency	14.33	11.81	N.S.
32. Acceleration of Development	12.00	12.19	N.S.
33. Achievement	22.33	21.48	N.S.

N = 3, 21
df = 22
***.01>2.819
**.05>2.074
*.10>1.717

[1] Unmatched t test

Less indication of initial differences is noted in expressed attitudes toward retardation between the fathers who completed counseling and those who did not begin. The areas reflecting such negligible variability are related to aspects of the protection and control of the behavior of the retardate.

The female sub-population (Table 437) also yielded indications of significant variation in three of the 33 AMR categories. Category 7 - Aggression displayed critical divergence at the .05 level, and 9 - Peer Interaction and 23 - Deification did so at the .10 level. The .01 level of significance was not obtained in any comparison.

TABLE 437

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON AMR SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Sexuality	9.33	9.90	N.S.
2. Genetic Responsibility	4.00	4.81	N.S.
3. Appearance	4.00	5.10	N.S.
4. Normalcy of Development	40.67	36.48	N.S.
5. Dependency	20.33	24.00	N.S.
6. Independency	26.33	26.39	N.S.
7. Aggression	12.33	17.26	2.04**
8. Guilt	18.33	19.68	N.S.
9. Peer Interaction	22.00	27.00	1.94*
10. Concept of Retardation	29.67	31.19	N.S.
11. Abasement	23.33	26.45	N.S.
12. Comprehension of Self/Others	14.67	18.03	N.S.
13. Counteraction	24.67	24.03	N.S.
14. Educational Implications and Training	22.33	25.19	N.S.
15. Community Provision	16.00	16.87	N.S.
16. Emotional-Social Behavior	22.00	27.68	N.S.
17. Expression of Affection	19.00	19.10	N.S.
18. Suppression of Sex	8.33	9.35	N.S.
19. Encouraging Verbalization	18.67	17.48	N.S.
20. Excluding Outside Influences	8.33	11.06	N.S.
21. Avoidance of Communication	11.00	10.22	N.S.
22. Suppression of Aggression	8.67	11.19	N.S.
23. Deification	9.00	12.77	1.86*
24. Comradeship and Sharing	19.00	18.16	N.S.

TABLE 437

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON AMR SCORES[1]
(CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	X	Y	t
25. Strictness	13.67	13.06	N.S.
26. Breaking the Will	9.33	10.39	N.S.
27. Irritability	13.00	13.97	N.S.
28. Autonomy of Child	18.33	17.84	N.S.
29. Equalitarianism	16.33	17.00	N.S.
30. Approval of Activity	13.00	12.29	N.S.
31. Fostering Dependency	9.33	11.22	N.S.
32. Acceleration of Development	11.00	11.29	N.S.
33. Achievement	21.67	20.94	N.S.

N = 3,31
df = 32
***.01> 2.740
**.05> 2.040
*.10> 1.695

[1] Unmatched t test

This minor occurrence of variability between the Combined Clinic and Attrition group on attitudes toward retardation is minimal. The variation noted here is essentially focused around aspects of the interactive behavior of the retardate. Essentially, negligible differences are found on the AMR between the individuals who complete counseling and those who do not enter into counseling. It seems that these differences are not great enough to influence the rejection of counseling expressed by the Attrition group.

D. Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC): Variable Scores.

The t test comparison of the Gradient Sentence Completion Test Variable scores for the Attrition and the Combined Clinic group (Table 438) yielded significant differences in six of the 35 category variables. Indications of significant divergence were obtained for variables 2 - Achievement, 4 - Acquisition, 19 - Nurturance and 20 - Omission at the .01 level, 31 - Submissiveness at the .05 level, and 21 - Optimism at the .10 level. This evidence of inter-group variability on the need personality variables measured by the GSC appears in personality trait areas which are concerned with achievement needs and submissive behavior as well as one's future outlook.

TABLE 438

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1]

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Abasement	1.33	2.00	N.S.
2. Achievement	24.83	18.02	3.17***
3. Acquiescence	13.00	10.29	N.S.
4. Acquisition	5.50	2.00	4.10***
5. Affiliation	15.67	14.13	N.S.
6. Aggression	3.17	3.71	N.S.
7. Autonomy	1.50	1.36	N.S.
8. Avoidance	1.50	1.35	N.S.
9. Benignness	6.00	5.98	N.S.
10. Counteraction	1.00	1.04	N.S.
11. Deference	2.33	2.27	N.S.
12. Description	3.50	4.02	N.S.
13. Dominance	3.00	4.04	N.S.
14. Identification	2.00	1.94	N.S.
15. Integrity	2.67	2.71	N.S.
16. Intellectual	7.50	6.06	N.S.
17. Irritability	2.67	3.54	N.S.
18. Narcissism	.50	.40	N.S.
19. Nurturance	6.67	11.36	8.63***

TABLE 438

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1]

(CONT)

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
20. Omission	2.17	7.42	6.22***
21. Optimism	.67	1.48	1.71*
22. Order	2.00	1.88	N.S.
23. Pessimism	.17	.29	N.S.
24. Phobia	1.50	2.23	N.S.
25. Play	4.17	2.86	N.S.
26. Refusal	2.67	2.48	N.S.
27. Rejection	9.17	8.19	N.S.
28. Seclusion	1.00	.50	N.S.
29. Sentience	8.17	11.12	N.S.
30. Sex	.50	.19	N.S.
31. Submissiveness	1.67	.63	2.01**
32. Succorance	2.33	3.25	N.S.
33. Supernatural	2.83	3.04	N.S.
34. Understanding	4.33	4.56	N.S.
35. Unhappiness	1.33	2.00	N.S.

N = 6,52
df = 56
***.01> 2.670
**.05> 2.005
*.10> 1.670

[1] Unmatched *t* test

The male sub-groups (Table 439) showed significant variation at the .01 level for category variable 4 - Acquisition, at the .05 level for 2 - Achievement and 27 - Rejection, and at the .10 level for 24 - Phobia and 34 - Understanding.

TABLE 439

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1]

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Abasement	2.00	1.95	N.S.
2. Achievement	26.33	18.24	2.72**
3. Acquiescence	14.00	10.76	N.S.
4. Acquisition	8.00	2.57	4.42***
5. Affiliation	13.33	13.38	N.S.
6. Aggression	3.00	3.05	N.S.
7. Autonomy	2.00	1.33	N.S.
8. Avoidance	2.00	1.90	N.S.
9. Benignness	4.00	5.62	N.S.
10. Counteraction	1.33	1.38	N.S.
11. Deference	2.67	2.14	N.S.
12. Description	5.00	4.52	N.S.
13. Dominance	3.00	4.57	N.S.
14. Identification	2.33	2.10	N.S.
15. Integrity	2.00	3.10	N.S.
16. Intellectual	8.67	6.71	N.S.
17. Irritability	2.33	3.76	N.S.
18. Narcissism	0	.43	N.S.
19. Nurturance	7.33	12.14	N.S.
20. Omission	3.00	6.76	N.S.
21. Optimism	.67	1.62	N.S.
22. Order	3.00	2.05	N.S.
23. Pessimism	0	.28	N.S.
24. Phobia	.67	2.28	1.76*
25. Play	5.33	3.19	N.S.
26. Refusal	1.33	2.57	N.S.
27. Rejection	12.00	7.57	2.37**

TABLE 439

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON GSC . VARIABLE SCORES[1] (CONT)

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
28. Seclusion	.33	.24	N.S.
29. Sentience	6.33	10.43	N.S.
30. Sex	0	.28	N.S.
31. Submissiveness	0	.62	N.S.
32. Succorance	2.67	3.33	N.S.
33. Supernatural	2.67	2.43	N.S.
34. Understanding	1.00	4.62	1.76*
35. Unhappiness	.67	1.38	N.S.

N = 3, 21
df = 22
***.01 > 2.819
**.05 > 2.074
*.10 > 1.717

[1] Unmatched t test

This relative frequency of occurrence is similar to that noted on the preceding total group contrast. The areas of expressed variability, however, differ somewhat. The male sub-group seems to exhibit a greater diversity on the more self-oriented variables than is found for the total group. The fathers reflect this general pattern in the 2- Achievement and 4 - Acquisition areas noted for the total group in Table 438.

The female sub-group (Table 440) also indicated significant variation between the Attrition and the Combined Clinic group on five category variables: 20 - Omission and 31 - Submissiveness at the .01 level; 30 - Sexuality at the .05 level; and 2 - Achievement and 34 - Understanding at the .10 level.

TABLE 440

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1]

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I		
	X	Y	t
1. Abasement	.67	2.03	N.S.
2. Achievement	3.33	17.87	1.74*
3. Acquiescence	12.00	9.97	N.S.
4. Acquisition	3.00	1.61	N.S.
5. Affiliation	18.00	14.64	N.S.
6. Aggression	3.33	4.16	N.S.
7. Autonomy	1.00	1.39	N.S.
8. Avoidance	1.00	.97	N.S.
9. Benignness	8.00	6.22	N.S.
10. Counteraction	.67	.81	N.S.
11. Deference	2.00	2.35	N.S.
12. Description	2.00	3.68	N.S.
13. Dominance	3.00	3.68	N.S.
14. Identification	1.67	1.84	N.S.
15. Integrity	3.33	2.45	N.S.
16. Intellectual	6.33	5.61	N.S.
17. Irritability	3.00	3.39	N.S.
18. Narcissism	1.00	.39	N.S.
19. Nurturance	6.00	10.84	N.S.
20. Omission	1.33	7.87	2.98***
21. Optimism	.67	1.39	N.S.
22. Order	1.00	1.77	N.S.
23. Pessimism	.33	.29	N.S.
24. Phobia	2.33	2.19	N.S.
25. Play	3.00	2.64	N.S.
26. Refusal	4.00	2.42	N.S.
27. Rejection	6.33	8.61	N.S.

TABLE 440

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON GSC VARIABLE SCORES[1]
(CONT)

Category Variables	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
28. Seclusion	1.67	.68	N.S.
29. Sentience	10.00	11.58	N.S.
30. Sex	1.00	.13	2.65**
31. Submissiveness	3.33	.64	3.56***
32. Succorance	2.00	3.19	N.S.
33. Supernatural	3.00	3.45	N.S.
34. Understanding	7.67	4.52	1.95*
35. Unhappiness	2.00	2.42	N.S.

N = 3, 31
df = 32
***.01> 2.740
**.05> 2.040
*.10> 1.695

[1] Unmatched t test

Here again, these differences essentially represent minor variation between the two groups on personality need variables. Differences essentially appear in benign or withdrawal content areas. The greater occurrence of 20 - Omission for the clinic groups creates an index of significant divergence between the two sub-groups. This trend is also reflected in the total group comparison (Table 438).

Some inter-group variability on the expressed need personality variables measured by the Gradient Sentence Completion test exists between the Attrition and the Combined Clinic group populations. It appears that the dominant personality needs of the Attrition group may be a contributing factor in accounting for the avoidance of counseling participation. These differences do not, however, appear in sufficient frequency or cohesive patterns in the father and mother sub-groups to warrant identification of major personality traits related to the initial differentiation in counseling participation behavior.

E. Gradient Sentence Completion Test (GSC):Direction Scores.

Both the 2 - Negative and 3 - Neutral GSC Direction designations exhibited statistically significant variation at the .01 level on the comparison of the Attrition and the Combined Clinic group (Table 441). No additional differences at the .05 or .10 levels were noted.

TABLE 441

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON GSC DIRECTION SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	X	Y	t
1. Positive	85.17	84.60	N.S.
2. Negative	58.17	85.96	12.20***
3. Neutral	5.67	5.67	43.90***

N = 6, 52
df = 56
***.01 > 2.670
**.05 > 2.005
*.10 > 1.670

[1] Unmatched t test

The same two categories, 2 - Negative and Neutral, displayed variation at the .01 degree of criticalness for the analysis of the father sub-group scores (Table 442). Again the Positive designation did not display significant divergence between the two groups.

TABLE 442

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON GSC DIRECTION SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Positive	80.67	86.62	N.S.
2. Negative	60.33	88.28	5.85***
3. Neutral	8.00	89.28	20.66***

N = 3, 21
df = 22
***.01> 2.819
**.05> 2.074
*.10> 1.717

[1] Unmatched t test

Table 443 presents the data for the female sub-group comparison. Statistically significant variability was obtained at the .01 level for the 2 - Negative and 3 - Neutral Direction categories. Differences at the .05 level are present for the Positive category.

TABLE 443

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON GSC DIRECTION SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Positive	89.67	83.22	2.38**
2. Negative	56.00	84.39	6.35***
3. Neutral	3.33	84.22	50.92***

N = 3, 31
df = 32
***.01> 2.740
**.05> 2.040
*.10> 1.695

[1] Unmatched t test

Thus it would seem that relatively major differences in direction orientation on the need personality variables exist between the group comprised of subjects who complete six counseling sessions and those who do not return for the first full session after completing the initial test battery. It is conceivable that the differences isolated by the comparison of these gross scores represent a critical point in the different behavior. It appears that the Combined Clinic group tends to be generally more negative than the Attrition group.

F. Stern Activities Index (SAI)

The comparison of the SAI scores for the Attrition and Combined Clinic group populations (Table 444) yielded indices of statistically significant variation on seven of the 40 categories. No t-scores achieved significance at the most critical .01 level. Categories 2 - Sexuality, 11 - Harmavoidance, 19 - Affiliation and 31 - Prudery were significant at the .05 level, and 4 - Play, 28 - Exhibitionism and 38 - Infavoidance met the criteria at the .10 level.

TABLE 444

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON SAI SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Sentience	4.00	3.19	N.S.
2. Sex	5.33	3.27	2.20**
3. Change	7.33	6.27	N.S.
4. Play	6.00	4.60	1.91*
5. Energy	7.00	5.77	N.S.
6. Pragmatism	7.50	7.36	N.S.
7. Adaptiveness	4.00	3.65	N.S.
8. Abasement	3.00	3.60	N.S.
9. Deference	7.33	6.83	N.S.
10. Order	4.67	5.83	N.S.

TABLE 444

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON SAI SCORES[1] (CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
11. Harmavoidance	5.67	7.58	2.09**
12. Understanding	4.50	5.31	N.S.
13. Counteraction	7.17	5.81	N.S.
14. Achievement	6.33	5.13	N.S.
15. Reflectiveness	6.00	5.71	N.S.
16. Humanism	5.33	5.36	N.S.
17. Scientism	4.17	4.12	N.S.
18. Objectivity	6.33	6.98	N.S.
19. Affiliation	8.83	6.90	2.09**
20. Nurturance	7.33	7.94	N.S.
21. Succorance	6.50	7.19	N.S.
22. Conjunctivity	5.17	6.13	N.S.
23. Aggression	2.83	2.15	N.S.
24. Dominance	4.17	3.50	N.S.
25. Naricissism	4.50	5.46	N.S.
26. Fantasied Achievement	6.67	5.54	N.S.
27. Ego Achievement	4.33	4.02	N.S.
28. Exhibitionism	4.83	3.36	1.68*
29. Impulsion	4.50	4.40	N.S.
30. Emotionality	2.50	3.02	N.S.
31. Prudery	4.67	6.73	2.20**
32. Sameness	2.67	3.73	N.S.
33. Passivity	3.00	4.42	N.S.
34. Rejection	2.00	2.50	N.S.
35. Autonomy	3.50	2.92	N.S.
36. Disjunctivity	4.83	3.86	N.S.

TABLE 444

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON SAI SCORES[1] (CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
37. Blameavoidance	7.17	7.85	N.S.
38. Infavoidance	4.17	5.42	1.82*
39. Deliberation	5.50	5.60	N.S.
40. Placidity	7.50	6.98	N.S.

N = 6,52
df = 56
***.01> 2.670
**.05> 2.005
*.10> 1.670

[1] Unmatched t test

These differences indicate a degree of divergence between the two groups on these personality dynamics. The diversity seems to be essentially centered in areas relevant to self-protection, gratification and amusement.

The comparison of the male subjects from these two groups (Table 445) showed statistically significant variation at the .05 level for category 4 - Play, and at the .10 level for 19 - Affiliation, 22 - Conjunctivity and 36 - Disjunctivity. No differences occurred at the .01 level. These areas of minor variability appear for the 22 - Conjunctivity - 36 - Disjunctivity dichotomy as well as for the more socially oriented 4 - Play and 19 - Affiliation topics.

TABLE 445

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON SAI SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Sentience	3.00	2.81	N.S.
2. Sex	5.67	3.38	N.S.
3. Change	7.67	6.19	N.S.
4. Play	6.67	4.42	2.37**
5. Energy	6.00	6.38	N.S.
6. Pragmatism	7.00	7.86	N.S.
7. Adaptiveness	5.00	3.57	N.S.
8. Abasement	2.33	3.33	N.S.
9. Deference	7.00	6.57	N.S.
10. Order	3.67	4.90	N.S.
11. Harmavoidance	6.67	6.48	N.S.
12. Understanding	3.67	5.81	N.S.
13. Counteraction	8.00	6.71	N.S.
14. Achievement	5.33	6.14	N.S.
15. Reflectiveness	5.67	5.76	N.S.
16. Humanism	4.33	6.05	N.S.
17. Scientism	4.00	5.76	N.S.
18. Objectivity	6.33	7.24	N.S.
19. Affiliation	9.33	6.95	1.74*
20. Nurturance	7.33	7.81	N.S.
21. Succorance	7.67	7.00	N.S.
22. Conjunctivity	4.67	6.48	2.03*
23. Aggression	3.33	2.67	N.S.
24. Dominance	5.00	4.24	N.S.
25. Narcissism	5.33	5.43	N.S.
26. Fantasied Achievement	7.33	6.05	N.S.
27. Ego Achievement	3.67	3.86	N.S.

TABLE 445

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON SAI SCORES[1]
(CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
28. Exhibitionism	5.33	3.76	N.S.
29. Impulsion	4.67	4.33	N.S.
30. Emotionality	2.33	2.43	N.S.
31. Prudery	4.33	6.62	N.S.
32. Sameness	2.33	3.81	N.S.
33. Passivity	4.00	4.10	N.S.
34. Rejection	1.67	2.57	N.S.
35. Autonomy	2.33	3.28	N.S.
36. Disjunctivity	5.33	3.52	2.03*
37. Blameavoidance	6.67	7.33	N.S.
38. Infavoidance	3.67	4.76	N.S.
39. Deliberation	5.33	5.67	N.S.
40. Placidity	7.67	7.57	N.S.

N = 3, 21
df = 22
***.01 > 2.819
**.05 > 2.074
*.10 > 1.717

[1] Unmatched t test

The scores obtained for the females (Table 446) exhibited statistically significant variability between the Attrition and the Combined Clinic group on 11 - Harmavoidance at the .01 level, 14 - Achievement 21 - Succorance and 35 - Autonomy at the .05 level, and 1 - Sentience, 5 - Energy and 33 - Passivity at the .10 level.

TABLE 446

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON SAI SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	$\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Sentience	5.00	3.45	1.74*
2. Sex	5.00	3.19	N.S.
3. Change	7.00	6.32	N.S.
4. Play	5.33	4.84	N.S.
5. Energy	8.00	5.35	2.03*
6. Pragmatism	8.00	7.03	N.S.
7. Adaptiveness	3.00	3.71	N.S.
8. Abasement	3.67	3.77	N.S.
9. Deference	7.67	7.00	N.S.
10. Order	5.67	6.45	N.S.
11. Harmavoidance	4.67	8.32	3.43***
12. Understanding	5.33	4.97	N.S.
13. Counteraction	6.33	5.19	N.S.
14. Achievement	7.33	4.45	2.16**
15. Reflectiveness	6.33	5.68	N.S.
16. Humanism	6.33	4.90	N.S.
17. Scientism	4.33	2.84	N.S.
18. Objectivity	6.33	6.81	N.S.
19. Affiliation	8.33	6.87	N.S.
20. Nurturance	7.33	8.03	N.S.
21. Succorance	5.33	7.32	2.09**
22. Conjunctivity	5.67	5.90	N.S.
23. Aggression	2.33	1.81	N.S.
24. Dominance	3.33	3.00	N.S.
25. Narcissism	3.67	5.48	N.S.
26. Fantasied Achievement	6.00	5.19	N.S.
27. Ego Achievement	5.00	4.13	N.S.

TABLE 446

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE ATTRITION AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON SAI SCORES[1]

(CONT)

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	X	Y	t
28. Exhibitionism	4.33	3.10	N.S.
29. Impulsion	4.33	4.45	N.S.
30. Emotionality	2.67	3.42	N.S.
31. Prudery	5.00	6.81	N.S.
32. Sameness	3.00	3.68	N.S.
33. Passivity	2.00	4.64	2.03*
34. Rejection	2.33	2.45	N.S.
35. Autonomy	4.67	2.68	2.09**
36. Disjunctivity	4.33	4.10	N.S.
37. Blameavoidance	7.67	8.19	N.S.
38. Infavoidance	4.67	5.87	N.S.
39. Deliberation	5.67	5.55	N.S.
40. Placidity	7.33	6.58	N.S.

N = 3,31
df = 32
***.01> 2.740
**.05> 2.040
*.10> 1.695

[1] Unmatched t test

These areas of statistical divergence are primarily dynamically related to the ego interests of the individual such as self protection, aid, independence and achievement. As this trend was also noted on the total group comparison, it is possible that the degree of self-involvement of the subjects constitutes a relevant factor in the participation in counseling sessions.

No consistent differences exist between the Attrition group, composed of individuals who did not attend any counseling sessions after completing the first test battery, and the Combined Clinic group of subjects who completed six counseling sessions within their own sub-group schema. Areas of major divergence seem to predominate in the direction of the GSC need personality traits as well as the degree of self-involvement of the subjects. This presents, in part, a pattern similar to the areas of variation observed in the comparison of the Clinic Dropout and the Combined Clinic groups (Question 9). It is conceivable that these areas of diversity are sufficient to account for the dropout behavior observed in six subjects after they completed the measuring instruments. The impact of the testing experience plus meeting their potential fellow participants may have influenced those individuals having generally higher need scores in the more self-oriented areas to withdraw from active participation in counseling.

QUESTION 11. WHAT DIFFERENCES EXIST IN ATTITUDES AND NEED PERSONALITY STRUCTURE BETWEEN A GROUP WHO ARE INTERVIEWED BUT DO NOT ENTER COUNSELING (CONTACT) AND THOSE WHO CONSUMMATE THEIR COUNSELING SESSIONS (EXPERIMENTAL)?

A t-test comparison of the DRQ scores of the Contact group and the Combined Clinic group was performed to determine whether certain factors in the area of familial adjustment might have relevance to the decision of the Contact group not to complete the initial test battery or to participate in counseling. These DRQ scores comprised the only data contrasted since the interview is the only measure completed for the Contact group.

Table 447 indicates that heterogeneity between the two groups existed in four of the five interview category areas pertinent to familial adjustment. Category 2 - Neighborhood, 3 - Activity-Goals, 4 - Community and 5 - Parental Relationships all showed variability at the .01 level of significance. Further differences at the .05 and .10 levels were not obtained.

TABLE 447

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTACT AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP ON DRQ SCORES[1]

	ADMINISTRATION I		
Categories	X	Y	t
1. Intra-Family	42.92	49.85	N.S.
2. Neighborhood	33.29	50.63	4.90***
3. Activity-Goals	56.02	48.27	4.78***
4. Community	60.50	68.23	2.75***
5. Parental Relationships	32.75	45.77	8.78***

N = 52,52
df = 102
***.01 > 2.620
**.05 > 1.982
*.10 > 1.660

[1] Unmatched t test

The comparison of the father sub-populations (Table 448) presented a very different picture as none of the five interview categories reached statistically significant levels of variation. It would seem that negligible diversity exists between the two male sub-groups on these topics.

TABLE 448

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTACT AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP FATHERS ON IRQ SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I		
	X	Y	t
1. Intra-Family	44.89	42.38	N.S.
2. Neighborhood	32.04	43.00	N.S.
3. Activity-Goals	55.61	38.57	N.S.
4. Community	61.64	64.57	N.S.
5. Parental Relationships	23.46	39.00	N.S.

N = 28, 21
df = 47
***.01> 2.680
**.05> 2.010
*.10> 1.675

[1] Unmatched t test

The female sub-group comparison (Table 449) yielded significant differentiation on category 1 - Intra-Family and 2 - Neighborhood at the .05 level. No differences attaining statistical significance at the .01 or .10 levels were obtained.

TABLE 449

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE CONTACT AND THE COMBINED CLINIC GROUP MOTHERS ON DRQ SCORES[1]

Categories	ADMINISTRATION I $\bar{X}$	$\bar{Y}$	t
1. Intra-Family	40.62	54.90	2.08**
2. Neighborhood	34.75	55.81	2.08**
3. Activity-Goals	56.50	54.84	N.S.
4. Community	59.17	70.71	N.S.
5. Parental Relationships	43.58	50.35	N.S.

N = 24, 31
df = 53
***.01 > 2.680
**.05 > 2.010
*.10 > 1.675

[1] Unmatched t test

The pattern presented by these three comparisons of DRQ scores is quite different for each sub-group. Major diversity exists when the total group is considered. No divergence is noted for the male sub-group while considerable differences are obtained for the females. The gross scores obtained by the quantification of the interview responses can only be viewed as indicative of patterns creating different behavioral modes within the initial population identified for participation in the study. On the basis of these data, variation in patterns of familial adjustment patterns might constitute a relevant factor. The Combined Clinic group appears to be higher in interpersonal relationships, while the Contact group seems to be more concerned with the achievement areas.

QUESTION 12. WHAT DIFFERENCES EXIST IN PARENTS OF EDUCABLE MENTALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN BETWEEN GENERAL ATTITUDES TOWARD CHILD-REARING PRACTICES AND SPECIFIC ATTITUDES RELEVANT TO RETARDATION?

One of the interests of this study concerns the investigation of the differences in the structure and the alteration pattern and stability of general versus specific attitudes. A matched t-test comparison was performed on parallel categories appearing on both the PARI as measures of general attitudes regarding child-rearing practices, and on the AMR with a specific reference to the condition of retardation. This comparison was carried out at each testing period for each of the seven treatment groups. Because of the different PARI form for males and females, the same number of categories are not compared in each instance. There are 12 comparable categories for the total group comparison, 13 for the father sub-group and 17 for the mothers. Summated difference scores were obtained for each of the comparable categories on the two instruments by subtracting the individual AMR category score from the corresponding PARI score.

A. Cazenovia Group

The initial testing period for the Cazenovia group (Table 450) yielded significant t-scores at the .05 level in two categories, 7 - Strictness and 9 - Autonomy of the Child. No significant differences were obtained at the .01 or .10 levels. This variability between the general and specific content reference area occurs in areas relating to the control exerted by the parent on the child.

TABLE 450

COMPARISON BETWEEN PARALLEL CATEGORIES ON THE PARI AND AMR SCORES FOR THE CAZENOVIA GROUP[1]

Category	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	ΣD	ΣD^2	t	ΣD	ΣD^2	t	ΣD	ΣD^2	t
1. Expression of Affection	-6	72	N.S.	-16	80	2.00*	-15	91	N.S.
2. Suppression of Sex	3	123	N.S.	3	23	N.S.	-1	25	N.S.
3. Avoidance of Communication	9	59	N.S.	5	69	N.S.	-5	29	N.S.
4. Suppression of Aggression	+2	72	N.S.	6	59	N.S.	9	49	N.S.
5. Deification	-7	63	N.S.	-9	55	N.S.	-3	63	N.S.
6. Comradeship and Sharing	13	71	N.S.	-9	19	2.07*	1	19	N.S.
7. Strictness	25	117	2.97**	3	73	N.S.	12	60	3.32**
8. Breaking the Will	0	64	N.S.	7	29	N.S.	14	56	2.07*
9. Autonomy of Child	19	75	2.72**	5	27	N.S.	-3	24	N.S.
10. Equalitarianism	1	51	N.S.	6	94	N.S.	3	23	N.S.
11. Fostering Dependency	-6	60	N.S.	1	95	N.S.	3	31	N.S.
12. Achievement	16	178	N.S.	-3	157	N.S.	28	204	N.S.

N = 12
df = 11
***.01 > 3.106
**.05 > 2.201
*.10 > 1.796

[1] Matched *t* test

On the first post-counseling comparison, the variation in these two areas did not appear but was replaced by minimal trends at the .10 level in categories 1 - Expression of Affection and 6 - Comradeship and Sharing. No significant differences were apparent at the .01 and .05 levels. The small dynamic shift seems to concentrate most on the personality development and personal inter-relationships. The immediate effect of the weekend counseling treatment seems to have been a diminution of the differentiation relating to control of the retardate and the normal child and some increase in diversity on topics related to the sharing and showing of affection.

This minor shift was not maintained as some return to initial patterns of variability was found on Test III. Category 7 - Strictness showed significance at the .01 level and 8 - Breaking the Will reached significance at the .10 level. No differences were obtained at the .05 level.

The divergence between general attitudes toward children and specific attitudes toward retarded children on control related topics initially observed is resumed after a period of no contact following counseling. The shift to variation on more personalized topics immediately following counseling is only temporary. Possibly the concentrated length of the counseling period is a contributing factor in this non-permanence. While these trends are noteworthy to trace over the three periods, the reader should be reminded of the minimal occurrence of variation noted at all levels and the absence of an increase or decrease in the frequency of variation over the three test periods. Essentially, the Cazenovia treatment group does not display unusual differences between expressed attitudes toward children in general and toward retarded children at any period.

For the father Cazenovia sub-group (Table 451) differences were initially observed for category 7 - Strictness and 13 - Achievement at the .05 level of significance. Additional variability at the .01 or the .10 levels was not detected.

TABLE 451

COMPARISON BETWEEN PARALLEL CATEGORIES ON THE PARI AND AMR SCORES FOR THE CAZENOVIA GROUP FATHERS[1]

Category	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	ΣD	ΣD^2	t	ΣD	ΣD^2	t	ΣD	ΣD^2	t
1. Expression of Affection	-11	59	N.S.	-17	79	2.50*	-15	89	N.S.
2. Suppression of Sex	-3	93	N.S.	-1	7	N.S.	-4	14	N.S.
3. Avoidance of Communication	2	14	N.S.	-3	45	N.S.	-3	11	N.S.
4. Suppression of Aggression	0	34	N.S.	2	27	N.S.	2	10	N.S.
5. Deification	-4	20	N.S.	-13	45	N.S.	-6	30	N.S.
6. Comradeship and Sharing	8	56	N.S.	-7	15	2.45*	3	15	N.S.
7. Strictness	12	42	2.50**	2	44	N.S.	3	25	N.S.
8. Breaking the Will	7	19	N.S.	5	19	N.S.	1	11	N.S.
9. Autonomy of Child	4	22	N.S.	1	21	N.S.	0	2	N.S.
10. Equalitarianism	3	27	N.S.	10	52	N.S.	2	14	N.S.
11. Approval of Activity	4	38	N.S.	6	10	2.75**	-6	32	N.S.
12. Fostering Dependency	-2	26	N.S.	-5	67	N.S.	1	17	N.S.
13. Achievement	21	121	2.78**	-3	17	N.S.	13	55	2.29*

N = 6
df = 5
***.01 > 4.032
**.05 > 2.571
*.10 > 2.015

[1] Matched *t* test

The areas displaying heterogeneity between attitudes toward children versus retarded children are essentially concerned with control and achievement content. Higher absolute scores in both instances are shown for the general attitudes of the PARI indicating a less pronounced standard of parental expectation for the retardate.

On the initial post-counseling comparison, differences at the .05 level were obtained in category 11 - Approval of Activity and at the .10 level for 1 - Expression of Affection and 6 - Comradeship and Sharing. Again, no significance was reached at the .01 level.

This pattern of differentiation between the general and specific reference areas is essentially the same as that noted at the same period for the total group. Diversity appears in the areas relevant to social interaction and disappears from those topics exhibiting significance prior to the initiation of this concentrated counseling treatment.

On the third test comparison, negligible variation was observed. Category 13 - Achievement exhibited significance at the .10 level. No significant differences were obtained at the .01 or .05 levels.

This represents a shift back toward the pre-counseling pattern. However, the variation noted in 7 - Strictness initially and immediately following counseling no longer appears. The shift here too was essentially temporary although a final decrease in the frequency and level of variation is also observed.

The male sub-group essentially follows the pattern presented on the total group comparison. The occurrence of differences between general and specific attitudes toward children and child-rearing are minimal. They are altered from a divergence on control items to those related to personal development by the weekend counseling experience but essentially resume their initial patterns after a period following the counseling.

The mother Cazenovia sub-group initial comparison (Table 452) exhibited significant variation between the PARI and AMR categories in one area, 12 - Autonomy of the Child at the .05 level. No .01 and .10 levels of significance were observed. The appearance of variation in this category for the total group and the male sub-group lend reliability to the difference noted here.

TABLE 452

COMPARISON BETWEEN PARALLEL CATEGORIES ON THE PARI AND AMR SCORES FOR THE CAZENOVIA GROUP MOTHERS[1]

Category	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	ΣD	ΣD^2	t	ΣD	ΣD^2	t	ΣD	ΣD^2	t
1. Expression of Affection	5	13	N.S.	1	1	N.S.	0	1	N.S.
2. Suppression of Sex	6	30	N.S.	4	16	N.S.	-5	11	N.S.
3. Encouraging Verbalization	8	30	N.S.	7	69	N.S.	2	4	N.S.
4. Excluding Outside Influences	14	102	N.S.	8	24	N.S.	5	19	N.S.
5. Avoidance of Communication	7	45	N.S.	8	24	N.S.	8	18	2.68**
6. Suppression of Aggression	-2	38	N.S.	4	32	N.S.	7	39	N.S.
7. Deification	-3	43	N.S.	4	10	N.S.	3	33	N.S.
8. Comradeship and Sharing	5	15	N.S.	-2	4	N.S.	-2	4	N.S.
9. Strictness	13	75	N.S.	1	29	N.S.	9	35	N.S.
10. Breaking the Will	-7	45	N.S.	2	10	N.S.	13	45	2.89**
11. Irritability	11	55	N.S.	-5	25	N.S.	4	22	N.S.
12. Autonomy of Child	15	53	3.48**	4	6	N.S.	-3	17	N.S.

TABLE 452

COMPARISON BETWEEN PARALLEL CATEGORIES ON THE PARI AND AMR SCORES FOR THE CAZENOVIA GROUP MOTHERS[1]
(CONT)

Category	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	ΣD	ΣD^2	t	ΣD	ΣD^2	t	ΣD	ΣD^2	t
13. Equalitarianism	-2	24	N.S.	-4	42	N.S.	1	9	N.S.
14. Approval of Activity	7	47	N.S.	-6	12	2.24*	-2	4	N.S.
15. Fostering Dependency	-4	34	N.S.	6	28	N.S.	2	14	N.S.
16. Acceleration of Development	-5	37	N.S.	5	25	N.S.	2	30	N.S.
17. Achievement	-5	57	N.S.	0	140	N.S.	15	149	N.S.

N = 6
df = 5
***.01 > 4.032
**.05 > 2.571
*.10 > 2.015

[1] Matched *t* test

On the first post-counseling battery, the Cazenovia mothers again displayed significance between the PARI and AMR parallel items on one category, 14 - Approval of Activity at the .10 level. No differences of the .01 or .05 level were found. This pattern is similar to that noted for the other Cazenovia population comparisons.

The third comparison showed differences for the mothers in two categories, 5 - Avoidance of Communication and 10 - Breaking the Will at the .05 level. No salient differences at the .01 or .10 level were observed.

A notable shift occurs in that this female sub-group essentially follows the same pattern of divergence as the total group and the father sub-group. Initial differences between general and specific attitudes occur in the control topic area. The concentrated counseling tends to produce a shift toward variation in personal relationships but the post-counseling period seems to provide an opportunity for an essential resumption of significant variation in the same general dynamic content areas noted on Test I, though not in the same specific categories.

The overall effect of the concentrated weekend counseling treatment on the structure and the alteration of the patterns of divergence between general attitudes toward children and specific attitudes toward retardation is minimal for the Cazenovia group. A shift in the areas of variability from an emphasis on control to personal interaction topics is noted after the counseling. The change is not permanent, however, as essentially the same initial patterns are resumed after the post-counseling period.

B. Minnowbrook Group.

The initial t test comparison of the comparable PARI and AMR categories for the Minnowbrook group (Table 453) indicated significant t-scores at the .05 level for category 1 - Expression of Affection and 12 - Achievement, and at the .10 level for 4 - Suppression of Aggression. No differences at the .01 level were obtained.

This comparison indicates the existence of initial minor variation within the Minnowbrook group between general and specific attitudes on topics relating to conforming behavior and achievement goals.

TABLE 453

COMPARISON BETWEEN PARALLEL CATEGORIES ON THE PARI AND AMR SCORES FOR THE MINNOWBROOK GROUP[1]

Category	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	ΣD	ΣD^2	t	ΣD	ΣD^2	t	ΣD	ΣD^2	t
1. Expression of Affection	-27	127	2.74**	-20	137	2.01*	-15	50	N.S.
2. Suppression of Sex	11	113	N.S.	2	60	N.S.	1	77	N.S.
3. Avoidance of Communication	4	112	N.S.	15	149	N.S.	19	97	2.08*
4. Suppression of Aggression	-26	184	2.06*	3	63	2.02*	-5	99	N.S.
5. Deification	6	124	N.S.	-9	97	N.S.	-2	58	N.S.
6. Comradeship and Sharing	-1	131	N.S.	-9	31	N.S.	-4	76	N.S.
7. Strictness	9	135	N.S.	4	116	N.S.	-5	65	N.S.
8. Breaking the Will	7	157	N.S.	-20	122	1.92*	7	173	N.S.
9. Autonomy of Child	8	56	N.S.	3	149	N.S.	-9	68	N.S.
10. Equalitarianism	10	106	N.S.	13	54	1.88*	7	145	N.S.
11. Fostering Dependency	-26	284	N.S.	-22	112	N.S.	-29	185	N.S.
12. Achievement	9	263	2.09**	35	267	2.36**	26	255	N.S.

N = 21
df = 20
***.01 > 2.845
**.05 > 2.086
*.10 > 1.725

[1] Matched *t* test

On the comparison of the data secured immediately at the termination of the week long counseling experience, significant diversity was found between the general and specific content of category 12 - Achievement at the .05 level, and 1 - Expression of Affection, 4 - Suppression of Aggression, 8 - Breaking the Will and 10 - Equalitarianism at the .10 level. No significant differences were obtained at the .01 level. This pattern indicates a maintenance of the specific pre-counseling variation as well as indications of some significance in the specific areas of control and social acceptance.

The final comparison yielded significant variation in only one instance, category 3 - Avoidance of Communication at the .10 level. No differences at the .01 and .05 levels were found.

Most noteworthy in this finding is the deletion of significance between the general and specific attitude categories noted in the two earlier administrations. Conceivably the post-counseling period affected a resolution of differences between attitudes toward children and child-rearing in general and those specifically related to retardation.

The t test comparison of the Minnowbrook father population (Table 454) on these two measures yielded initial significance for one category only, 1 - Expression of Affection at the .01 level. No significant differences were apparent at the .05 or .10 levels.

TABLE 454

COMPARISON BETWEEN PARALLEL CATEGORIES ON THE PARI AND AMR SCORES FOR THE MINNOWBROOK GROUP FATHERS[1]

Category	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	ΣD	ΣD^2	t	ΣD	ΣD^2	t	ΣD	ΣD^2	t
1: Expression of Affection	-27	123	5.93***	-22	120	3.62**	-16	49	N.S.
2. Suppression of Sex	2	48	N.S.	8	32	N.S.	9	33	N.S.
3. Avoidance of Communication	1	31	N.S.	-4	46	N.S.	5	13	N.S.
4. Suppression of Aggression	-7	49	N.S.	-5	21	N.S.	-2	44	N.S.
5. Deification	-6	36	N.S.	-9	41	N.S.	-7	29	N.S.
6. Comradeship and Sharing	-3	23	N.S.	-4	24	N.S.	-8	50	N.S.
7. Strictness	3	51	N.S.	-8	30	N.S.	-7	21	1.87*
8. Breaking the Will	5	75	N.S.	0	16	N.S.	-9	77	N.S.
9. Autonomy of Child	2	2	N.S.	-1	121	N.S.	-8	48	N.S.
10. Equalitarianism	9	51	N.S.	3	16	N.S.	13	115	N.S.
11. Approval of Activity	4	44	N.S.	0	10	N.S.	-5	79	N.S.
12. Fostering Dependency	-16	138	N.S.	-8	44	N.S.	-9	53	N.S.
13. Achievement	-8	76	N.S.	1	31	N.S.	-1	176	N.S.

N = 7
df = 6
***.01 > 3.707
**.05 > 2.447
*.10 > 1.943

[1] Matched *t* test

The comparison of the scores immediately following counseling also showed significant variation for only one category, 1 - Expression of Affection at the .05 level. Differences at the .01 and .10 levels were not obtained. Counseling seems to have had no noticeable effect upon the alteration of the pattern or frequency of variation between general and specific attitudes for the Minnowbrook fathers.

The third test comparison showed significant variability in category 7 - Strictness at the .10 level. No further differences at the .01 or .05 levels were obtained.

At all three of the test periods, significance noted is well within the limits of chance occurrence. The only notable change is the appearance of 7 - Strictness on Test III in place of 1 - Expression of Affection. Dynamically this is a shift from an interest in inter-relationships to concern for control of the child. However, major differences between the two levels of specificity do not exist in the male Minnowbrook group initially nor are they influenced by the counseling or post-counseling period.

The initial comparison of the PARI and AMR categories for the Minnowbrook mother sub-group (Table 455) showed no occurrence of significant variation at any level. After counseling, significance was observed for category 14 - Approval of Activity at the .01 level, 10 - Breaking the Will and 17 - Achievement at the .05 level, and 5 - Avoidance of Communication and 15 - Fostering Dependency at the .10 level.

TABLE 455

COMPARISON BETWEEN PARALLEL CATEGORIES ON THE PARI AND AMR SCORES FOR THE MINNOWBROOK GROUP MOTHERS[1]

Category	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	ΣD	ΣD^2	t	ΣD	ΣD^2	t	ΣD	ΣD^2	t
1. Expression of Affection	0	4	N.S.	2	17	N.S.	1	1	N.S.
2. Suppression of Sex	9	65	N.S.	-6	28	N.S.	-8	34	N.S.
3. Encouraging Verbalization	10	48	N.S.	3	9	N.S.	5	149	N.S.
4. Excluding Outside Influences	11	191	N.S.	-8	44	N.S.	0	16	N.S.
5. Avoidance of Communication	3	81	N.S.	19	103	1.97*	14	84	N.S.
6. Suppression of Aggression	-19	135	N.S.	8	42	N.S.	-3	55	N.S.
7. Deification	12	88	N.S.	0	56	N.S.	5	29	N.S.
8. Comradeship and Sharing	2	18	N.S.	-5	7	N.S.	4	26	N.S.
9. Strictness	6	84	N.S.	12	86	N.S.	2	114	N.S.
10. Breaking the Will	2	82	N.S.	-20	106	2.19**	16	96	N.S.
11. Irritability	-3	151	N.S.	-2	46	N.S.	7	45	N.S.
12. Autonomy of Child	6	54	N.S.	2	28	N.S.	-1	26	N.S.
13. Equalitarianism	1	55	N.S.	10	38	N.S.	-6	30	N.S.
14. Approval of Activity	10	88	N.S.	26	82	5.17***	15	49	2.52**
15. Fostering Dependency	-10	146	N.S.	-14	68	2.04*	-20	132	1.89*
16. Acceleration of Development	7	67	N.S.	-3	77	N.S.	8	84	N.S.
17. Achievement	17	187	N.S.	34	236	2.58**	27	179	2.31**

N = 14
df = 13
***.01 > 3.012

**.05 > 2.160
*.10 > 1.771

[1] Matched *t* test

It would seem that divergence between general and specific attitude patterns for this sub-group is influenced by the week-long counseling experience. The category areas reflecting diversity relate to a number of variables: achievement goals, control, protectiveness and support.

On the third test comparison differences were present at the .05 level for category 14 - Approval of Activity and 17 - Achievement, and at the .10 level for 15 - Fostering Dependency. No differences at the .01 level appeared.

All three of these categories represent a maintenance of variability first observed after counseling. The other differences noted at that time seem to have diminished to non-significant levels over the post-counseling period.

The pattern shown by the Minnowbrook group as a whole suggests an appreciable increase in variation between general and specific attitudes with counseling. However, this is not generally maintained after a period of no contact. The fathers show little variation throughout. The mothers present a pattern of increase in divergence with counseling and they also tend to maintain a somewhat greater amount over the post-counseling period. Consequently, mothers tend to be more susceptible than fathers to change in general and specific child-rearing patterns after a week-long counseling session.

C. Twice a Month Group

Table 456 presents the results of the t test comparison of the PARI and AMR parallel items for the Twice a Month clinic group. On the pre-test, variation occurred at statistically significant levels for category 11 - Fostering Dependency at the .01 level and 12 - Achievement at the .10 level, while none was attained at the .05 level. This pattern of initial variation in the achievement-goals and protective content areas is consistent with the pattern noted on the groups already discussed.

TABLE 456

COMPARISON BETWEEN PARALLEL CATEGORIES ON THE PARI AND AMR SCORES FOR THE TWICE A MONTH GROUP[1]

Category	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	ΣD	ΣD^2	t	ΣD	ΣD^2	t	ΣD	ΣD^2	t
1. Expression of Affection	0	46	N.S.	-13	83	N.S.	-20	204	N.S.
2. Suppression of Sex	-9	70	N.S.	-1	43	N.S.	-14	32	3.54***
3. Avoidance of Communication	-3	47	N.S.	11	43	N.S.	5	79	N.S.
4. Suppression of Aggression	1	89	N.S.	-21	123	N.S.	-7	59	N.S.
5. Deification	-6	80	N.S.	-2	40	N.S.	-3	53	N.S.
6. Comradeship and Sharing	1	13	N.S.	8	22	1.90*	-1	11	N.S.
7. Strictness	7	25	N.S.	22	116	2.47**	2	100	N.S.
8. Breaking the Will	12	54	N.S.	13	37	2.66**	-2	100	N.S.
9. Autonomy of Child	9	27	N.S.	11	31	2.34**	8	20	2.02*
10. Equalitarianism	3	23	N.S.	10	36	1.84*	19	59	3.54***
11. Fostering Dependency	-21	77	3.29***	-39	157	8.60***	16	90	1.88*
12. Achievement	19	169	1.94*	29	269	N.S.	1	211	2.33**

N = 11
df = 10
***.01 > 3.169
**.05 > 2.228
*.10 > 1.812

[1] Matched *t* test

The initial post-counseling comparison yielded significant differences for: 11 - Fostering Dependency at the .01 level; 7 - Strictness, 8 - Breaking the Will and 9 - Autonomy of the Child at the .05 level; and 6 - Comradeship and Sharing and 10 - Equalitarianism at the .10 level.

This represents a prominent increase in the occurrence of differentiation between the expressed general and specific attitudes. An increase in variability is noted in control areas as well as interactive patterns. The significance initially observed for 12 - Achievement is not maintained.

On the third test battery, significance was reached at the .01 level for 2 - Suppression of Sexuality and 10 - Equalitarianism, and at the .05 level for 9 - Autonomy of the Child and 11 - Fostering Dependency. No differences appeared at the .10 level.

These differences are for the most part carried over from the second administration. Differentiation for 12 - Achievement returns to significance and new variability appears in 2 - Suppression of Sexuality.

Counseling seems to have increased the variation between the general and specific expressed attitudes of the Twice a Month group. The majority of this variation maintains itself over the 6-9 months post-counseling period.

In the comparison of the father sub-group (Table 457), no initial variation was found at any level for the 13 comparable categories. On the post-counseling analysis, significant t scores were obtained for category 1 - Expression of Affection and 12 - Fostering Dependency at the .05 level, and for 13 - Achievement at the .10 level. No differences at the .01 level were derived. Thus counseling seems to have stimulated some variation in the patterns of general and specific attitudes relevant to achievement, protectiveness and affection as measured by the PARI and AMR.

TABLE 457

COMPARISON BETWEEN PARALLEL CATEGORIES ON THE PARI AND AMR SCORES FOR THE TWICE A MONTH GROUP FATHERS[1]

Category	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	ΣD	ΣD^2	t	ΣD	ΣD^2	t	ΣD	ΣD^2	t
1. Expression of Affection	-6	28	N.S.	-16	78	3.70**	-22	198	N.S.
2. Suppression of Sex	2	2	N.S.	2	6	N.S.	-5	13	N.S.
3. Avoidance of Communication	0	6	N.S.	5	21	N.S.	5	13	N.S.
4. Suppression of Aggression	-2	30	N.S.	-8	38	N.S.	-3	5	N.S.
5. Deification	-7	45	N.S.	-3	11	N.S.	-8	18	N.S.
6. Comradeship and Sharing	-3	3	N.S.	2	4	N.S.	1	5	N.S.
7. Strictness	2	2	N.S.	-1	7	N.S.	-2	10	N.S.
8. Breaking the Will	6	28	N.S.	3	9	N.S.	-4	18	N.S.
9. Autonomy of Child	5	15	N.S.	5	15	N.S.	1	1	N.S.
10. Equalitarianism	3	13	N.S.	4	8	N.S.	8	20	3.47**
11. Approval of Activity	-5	55	N.S.	-11	83	N.S.	-5	37	N.S.
12. Fostering Dependency	-8	30	N.S.	-13	51	3.81**	-1	15	N.S.
13. Achievement	4	18	N.S.	12	48	3.00*	-14	114	N.S.

N = 4
df = 3
***.01 > 5.841
**.05 > 3.182
*.10 > 2.353

[1] Matched *t* test

On the third testing, the differences observed on Administration II didn't seem to exist, and variability in only one category, 10 - Equalitarianism was achieved at the .05 level. Thus, while counseling influenced divergence, these patterns were not essentially maintained for the male segment of the Twice a Month group.

The mothers in the Twice a Month group (Table 458) displayed pre-counseling significance in only one category, 15 - Fostering Dependency at the .05 level. No further differences at the .01 or .10 levels were obtained. Significant variation in this category appeared on the pre-test for the total group comparison also.

TABLE 458

COMPARISON BETWEEN PARALLEL CATEGORIES ON THE PARI AND AMR SCORES FOR THE TWICE A MONTH GROUP MOTHERS[1]

	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
Category	ΣD	ΣD^2	t	ΣD	ΣD^2	t	ΣD	ΣD^2	t
1. Expression of Affection	6	18	N.S.	3	5	N.S.	2	6	N.S.
2. Suppression of Sex	-11	67	N.S.	-3	37	N.S.	-9	19	3.05**
3. Encouraging Verbalization	1	19	N.S.	4	22	N.S.	5	15	N.S.
4. Excluding Outside Influences	-4	76	N.S.	-7	43	N.S.	-2	32	N.S.
5. Avoidance of Communication	-3	31	N.S.	6	22	N.S.	0	66	N.S.
6. Suppression of Aggression	3	59	N.S.	-13	85	N.S.	-4	54	N.S.
7. Deification	-1	35	N.S.	1	29	N.S.	5	35	N.S.
8. Comradeship and Sharing	4	10	N.S.	6	18	N.S.	-2	6	N.S.
9. Strictness	5	23	N.S.	23	109	3.68**	4	90	N.S.
10. Breaking the Will	6	26	N.S.	10	28	2.50**	2	82	N.S.

TABLE 458

COMPARISON BETWEEN PARALLEL CATEGORIES ON THE PARI AND AMR SCORES FOR THE TWICE A MONTH GROUP MOTHERS[1] (CONT)

Category	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	ΣD	ΣD^2	t	ΣD	ΣD^2	t	ΣD	ΣD^2	t
11. Irritability	9	27	N.S.	5	206	N.S.	-18	166	N.S.
12. Autonomy of Child	4	12	N.S.	6	16	N.S.	7	19	N.S.
13. Equalitarianism	0	10	N.S.	6	28	N.S.	11	39	2.22*
14. Approval of Activity	3	15	N.S.	4	16	N.S.	4	22	N.S.
15. Fostering Dependency	-13	47	2.52**	-26	116	5.46***	17	75	2.71**
16. Acceleration of Development	1	23	N.S.	-1	15	N.S.	2	24	N.S.
17. Achievement	15	151	N.S.	17	221	N.S.	15	97	N.S.

N = 7
df = 6
***.01 > 3.707
**.05 > 2.447
*.10 > 1.943

---

[1] Matched t test

On Administration II scores, this same category, 15 - Fostering Dependency maintained variability, but at the .01 level. Differences also appeared in two additional categories at the .05 level of significance, 9 - Strictness and 10 - Breaking the Will. No differences at the .10 level were attained. Consequently counseling would seem to have had an immediate effect in creating additional divergence between general and specific attitudes relating to control of behavior.

The third test comparison yielded significant variation for category 2 - Suppression of Sexuality and 15 - Fostering Dependency at the .05 level, and 13 - Equalitarianism at the .10 level. No significance appeared at the .01 level.

The post-counseling period seems to have diminished heterogeneity occurring immediately after counseling. New indications, however, are noted in similar content areas. The significant differentiation for 15 - Fostering Dependency maintains itself over the three test periods.

The Twice a Month group tends to show similar initial patterns of variation to those presented by the Cazenovia and Minnowbrook group, but exhibits more frequent and permanent alteration of patterns and increase of occurrence with counseling and the following no-contact period. As in the other groups, less increase in variation seems to occur initially and with counseling treatment for the male segment than for the females and the total group.

D. Once a Month Group

No significant differences for any of the 12 categories were found on the PARI - AMR comparison for the Twice a Month group (Table 459) on Administration I or II. Only one category, 10 - Equalitarianism was significant at the .05 level on the third administration. No differences at the .01 and .10 levels were obtained.

TABLE 459

COMPARISON BETWEEN PARALLEL CATEGORIES ON THE PARI AND AMR SCORES FOR THE ONCE A MONTH GROUP

Category	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	ΣD	$ΣD^2$	t	ΣD	$ΣD^2$	t	ΣD	$ΣD^2$	t
1. Expression of Affection	1	681	N.S.	10	52	N.S.	10	42	N.S.
2. Suppression of Sex	0	74	N.S.	1	33	N.S.	4	62	N.S.
3. Avoidance of Communication	21	174	N.S.	-2	28	N.S.	-11	84	N.S.
4. Suppression of Aggression	3	97	N.S.	-1	51	N.S.	-2	12	N.S.
5. Deification	3	57	N.S.	-13	93	N.S.	7	23	N.S.
6. Comradeship and Sharing	-18	362	N.S.	7	61	N.S.	7	35	N.S.
7. Strictness	4	58	N.S.	1	73	N.S.	8	56	N.S.
8. Breaking the Will	-9	177	N.S.	-11	71	N.S.	10	94	N.S.
9. Autonomy of Child	2	294	N.S.	11	27	N.S.	2	4	N.S.
10. Equalitarianism	-2	266	N.S.	-2	68	N.S.	-8	20	2.69**
11. Fostering Dependency	-15	157	N.S.	-17	81	N.S.	-2	36	N.S.
12. Achievement	17	235	N.S.	6	192	N.S.	14	152	N.S.

N = 8
df = 7
***.01 > 3.499
**.05 > 2.365
*.10 > 1.895

[1] Matched t test

The initial pattern of homogeneity between the general and specific attitudes of the Once a Month group subjects is not altered by the counseling treatment.

The Once a Month group fathers (Table 460) exhibited initial divergence for two categories, 1 - Expression of Affection and 12 - Fostering Dependency, both at the .05 level of significance. No other differences at the .01 or .10 levels were found. These two areas of divergence have also occurred as statistically significant in a number of the preceding comparisons.

The post-counseling comparisons on Test II and Test III yielded no statistically significant variability.

TABLE 460

COMPARISON BETWEEN PARALLEL CATEGORIES ON THE PARI AND AMR SCORES FOR THE ONCE A MONTH GROUP FATHERS[1]

	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
Category	ΣD	ΣD^2	t	ΣD	ΣD^2	t	ΣD	ΣD^2	t
1. Expression of Affection	26	214	3.38**	8	42	N.S.	10	42	N.S.
2. Suppression of Sex	-2	66	N.S.	-3	15	N.S.	-7	57	N.S.
3. Avoidance of Communication	8	102	N.S.	-2	14	N.S.	-9	42	N.S.
4. Suppression of Aggression	-2	36	N.S.	1	37	N.S.	0	6	N.S.
5. Deification	7	47	N.S.	-6	44	N.S.	7	21	N.S.
6. Comradeship and Sharing	4	14	N.S.	7	51	N.S.	2	14	N.S.
7. Strictness	3	45	N.S.	-6	58	N.S.	0	10	N.S.
8. Breaking the Will	-11	149	N.S.	-9	49	N.S.	6	54	N.S.
9. Autonomy of Child	11	139	N.S.	7	17	N.S.	-1	1	N.S.

TABLE 460

COMPARISON BETWEEN PARALLEL CATEGORIES ON THE PARI AND AMR SCORES FOR THE ONCE A MONTH GROUP FATHERS[1]

(CONT)

Category	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	ΣD	ΣD^2	t	ΣD	ΣD^2	t	ΣD	ΣD^2	t
10. Equalitarianism	14	122	N.S.	-1	25	N.S.	-4	14	N.S.
11. Approval of Activity	3	27	N.S.	-2	18	N.S.	0	8	N.S.
12. Fostering Dependency	-9	23	4.69**	-2	18	N.S.	-3	9	N.S.
13. Achievement	-1	139	N.S.	-8	122	N.S.	-1	15	N.S.

N = 4
df = 3
***.01 > 5.841
**.05 > 3.182
*.10 > 2.353

[1] Matched *t* test

While the initial occurrence of statistically significant variation is relatively minor, counseling seems to have been a factor in the reduction of the diversity. The change noted immediately following counseling seems to be maintained over the post-counseling period. This is the first occurrence of a diminution of differences between general and specific attitudes immediately following counseling.

The Once a Month group (Table 461) initial comparison for the mothers yielded a statistically significant t for only one of the 17 categories compared, category 14 - Approval of Activity at the .05 level. No further differences at the .01 and .10 levels occurred. On the first post-counseling analysis, differences at the .05 level were obtained for category 9 - Strictness, and at the .10 level for 17 - Achievement. No differences at the .01 level occurred.

TABLE 461

COMPARISON BETWEEN PARALLEL CATEGORIES ON THE PARI AND AMR SCORES FOR THE ONCE A MONTH GROUP MOTHERS[1]

Category	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II			ADMINISTRATION III		
	ΣD	ΣD^2	t	ΣD	ΣD^2	t	ΣD	ΣD^2	t
1. Expression of Affection	-25	467	N.S.	2	10	N.S.	0	0	N.S.
2. Suppression of Sex	2	28	N.S.	4	18	N.S.	3	5	N.S.
3. Encouraging Verbalization	-17	207	N.S.	-1	7	N.S.	1	3	N.S.
4. Excluding Outside Influences	-7	91	N.S.	-3	11	N.S.	5	17	N.S.
5. Avoidance of Communication	13	72	N.S.	0	14	N.S.	-2	42	N.S.
6. Suppression of Aggression	5	61	N.S.	-2	14	N.S.	2	6	N.S.
7. Deification	-4	12	N.S.	-7	49	N.S.	0	2	N.S.
8. Comradeship and Sharing	-22	348	N.S.	0	10	N.S.	5	21	N.S.
9. Strictness	1	13	N.S.	7	15	3.65**	8	46	N.S.
10. Breaking the Will	2	28	N.S.	-2	22	N.S.	4	40	N.S.
11. Irritability	-10	76	N.S.	5	13	N.S.	-1	19	N.S.
12. Autonomy of Child	-9	155	N.S.	4	10	N.S.	3	3	N.S.
13. Equalitarianism	-16	144	N.S.	-1	43	N.S.	-4	6	N.S.
14. Approval of Activity	10	30	3.86**	2	12	N.S.	10	66	N.S.
15. Fostering Dependency	-6	134	N.S.	-15	63	N.S.	1	27	N.S.
16. Acceleration of Development	5	69	N.S.	2	10	N.S.	3	11	N.S.
17. Achievement	18	196	N.S.	14	70	2.64*	15	137	N.S.

N = 4

df = 3

***.01 $>$ 5.841

**.05 $>$ 3.182

*.10 $>$ 2.353

[1] Matched *t* test

This is a relatively minor increase in frequency of differentiation between general and specific aspects. It does reflect a diminution in the original variation as well as an initiation of significant variability in the control and achievement areas. This is a fairly common trend also noted in previous groups.

The third t comparison yielded no significant differences indicative of unusual variation between the general PARI items and the AMR items specifically related to retardation. The minor change noted after counseling is not maintained over the post-counseling period for this sub-group.

In general, the Once a Month group shows the least alteration and frequency of general-specific variability with counseling and/or the post-counseling period of the four clinic groups. It is possible that this very distributed counseling approach did not have the immediate or delayed impact that the more concentrated groups seem to exhibit. Since initial differences are similar to those noted for the other groups and since minimal differences on initial variability for both these instruments indicate that the subjects in this group constitute a representative sample of the full population, these differences may be related to counseling treatment. The greatest change or increase in variation is found in the Twice a Month group where counseling was not as distributed as for the Once a Month group, nor as concentrated as in the Cazenovia and Minnowbrook groups.

E. Control Group.

This same t test comparison of the PARI-AMR parallel categories was performed for the Control group (Table 462). On the initial analysis significant differences were obtained in categories 1 - Expression of Affection, 4 - Suppression of Aggression, and 8 - Breaking the Will at the .05 level, and 3 Avoidance of Communication at the .10 level. No differences appeared at the .01 level.

TABLE 462

COMPARISON BETWEEN PARALLEL CATEGORIES ON THE PARI AND AMR SCORES FOR THE CONTROL GROUP[1]

Category	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	ΣD	ΣD^2	t	ΣD	ΣD^2	t
1. Expressions of Affection	-47	427	2.95**	29	305	N.S.
2. Suppression of Sex	1	71	N.S.	-6	74	N.S.
3. Avoidance of Communication	20	120	1.84*	-12	78	N.S.
4. Suppression of Aggression	21	109	2.27**	-22	76	3.74***
5. Deification	1	115	N.S.	-9	57	N.S.
6. Comradeship and Sharing	-10	224	N.S.	3	35	N.S.
7. Strictness	6	248	N.S.	-1	57	N.S.
8. Breaking the Will	23	123	2.39**	17	45	3.23***
9. Autonomy of Child	-3	185	N.S.	19	93	2.22**
10. Equalitarianism	10	114	N.S.	7	67	N.S.
11. Fostering Dependency	-8	130	N.S.	10	128	N.S.
12. Achievement	6	328	N.S.	1	411	N.S.

N = 15
df = 14
***.01 > 2.977
**.05 > 2.145
*.10 > 1.761

[1] Matched *t* test

These significant patterns of variability occur in areas primarily concerned with topics of control and interpersonal relations. This coincides with the picture of differentiation appearing on preceding group comparisons.

On the re-test after a 6-9 months period, statistically significant differences appeared for categories 4 - Suppression of Aggression and 8 - Breaking the Will at the .01 level, and 9 - Autonomy of the Child at the .05 level. No trends at the .10 level were found.

In comparison with the pre-test findings, two of these three categories appear specifically while the third category represents a change within the broad area of control. It would seem that the minimal shift has occurred in both the frequency of variation and the specific areas.

Table 463 presents the results of the comparison of the PARI-AMR scores for the husbands of the Control group. Categories 1 - Expression of Affection and 8 - Breaking the Will both displayed t-scores reaching statistical significance at the .01 level. No further differences at the .05 or .10 levels were obtained. The frequency and areas of occurrence of this general-specific variation conform to the pattern previously noted with interpersonal relations and control displaying divergence.

On the second test analysis, significant differences were obtained for 8 - Breaking the Will at the .05 level, and for 1 - Expression of Affection and 3 - Avoidance of Communication at the .10 level. No differences appeared at the .01 level. Hence, the pre-test pattern of frequency and distribution of variability is essentially maintained over the two periods for the male Control group subjects.

TABLE 463

COMPARISON OF FATHERS ON PARALLEL CATEGORIES OF THE PARI AND AMR SCORES FOR THE CONTROL GROUP[1]

Category	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	ϵD	ϵD^2	t	ϵD	ϵD^2	t
1. Expression of Affection	-36	224	5.35***	-32	298	2.41*
2. Suppression of Sex	1	21	N.S.	4	14	N.S.
3. Avoidance of Communication	4	16	N.S.	-13	59	2.04*
4. Suppression of Aggression	12	64	N.S.	-9	35	N.S.
5. Deification	7	73	N.S.	0	12	N.S.
6. Comradeship and Sharing	-6	56	N.S.	2	32	N.S.
7. Strictness	17	151	N.S.	8	34	N.S.
8. Breaking the Will	16	50	4.05***	12	30	3.62**
9. Autonomy of Child	-3	31	N.S.	-1	3	N.S.
10. Equalitarianism	9	33	N.S.	4	18	N.S.
11. Approval of Activity	-7	105	N.S.	6	42	N.S.
12. Fostering Dependency	6	16	N.S.	5	93	N.S.
13. Achievement	9	89	N.S.	16	244	N.S.

N = 7
df=6
***.01 $>$ 3.707
**.05 $>$ 2.447
*.10 $>$ 1.943

[1] Matched t test

The female Control population (Table 464) showed initial PARI-AMR differentiation on category 14 - Approval of Activity at the .10 level. No further occurrence of significant differences at the .01 or .05 levels was found.

TABLE 464

COMPARISON BETWEEN PARALLEL CATEGORIES ON THE PARI AND AMR SCORES FOR THE CONTROL GROUP MOTHERS[1]

Category	ADMINISTRATION I			ADMINISTRATION II		
	ΣD	ΣD^2	t	ΣD	ΣD^2	t
1. Expression of Affection	-11	203	N.S.	3	7	N.S.
2. Suppression of Sex	0	50	N.S.	-10	60	N.S.
3. Encouraging Verbalization	-11	94	N.S.	1	9	N.S.
4. Excluding Outside Influences	-3	17	N.S.	-13	47	2.39**
5. Avoidance of Communication	6	44	N.S.	1	19	N.S.
6. Suppression of Aggression	-9	45	N.S.	-13	41	2.73**
7. Deification	-6	42	N.S.	-9	45	N.S.
8. Comradeship and Sharing	-4	168	N.S.	1	3	N.S.
9. Strictness	-11	97	N.S.	-7	23	N.S.
10. Breaking the Will	7	73	N.S.	5	15	N.S.
11. Irritability	-6	134	N.S.	20	116	2.30*
12. Autonomy of Child	0	154	N.S.	29	90	2.96**
13. Equalitarianism	1	81	N.S.	3	49	N.S.
14. Approval of Activity	-23	187	1.95*	1	33	N.S.
15. Fostering Dependency	-1	25	N.S.	-16	86	2.04*
16. Acceleration of Development	5	219	N.S.	7	27	N.S.
17. Achievement	-3	239	N.S.	-15	167	N.S.

N = 8
df = 7
***.01 > 3.499
**.05 > 2.365
*.10 > 1.860

[1] Matched *t* test

On the follow-up contrast of the two sets of scores, differences were obtained for categories 4 - Excluding Outside Influences, 6 - Suppression of Aggression and 12 - Autonomy of the Child at the .05 level, and for 11 - Irritability and 15 - Fostering Dependency at the .10 level. No differences at the .01 level were attained. This represents a considerable increase in frequency of divergence between the general PARI items and the more specific AMR topics.

The Control group, as a whole, essentially shows a relatively consistent pattern of minimal variability between general and specific attitudes over the two test periods. This is in contrast to a general increase at Test II noted for the clinic groups. However, the female Control sub-group displays an increase in variation on the second testing.

It appears that the clinic groups show more change than the Control group which suggests that counseling affects general and specific attitudes toward child-rearing practices.

F. Clinic Dropout Group.

A t-test comparison of the PARI-AMR parallel categories was performed on the test I data for the Clinic Dropout group in order to ascertain patterns of variation between general and specific attitude levels. Table 465 indicates the existence of statistically significant variation between the two sets of scores for categories 2 - Suppression of Sexuality and 3 - Avoidance of Communication at the .05 level, and for 6 - Comradeship and Sharing and 10 - Equalitarianism at the .10 level. No salient differences occurred at the .01 level.

TABLE 465
COMPARISON BETWEEN PARALLEL CATEGORIES ON THE PARI AND AMR SCORES FOR THE CLINIC DROPOUT GROUP[1]

Category	ADMINISTRATION I		
	ΣD	ΣD^2	t
1. Expressions of Affection	-27	467	N.S.
2. Suppression of Sex	29	153	3.05**
3. Avoidance of Communication	23	129	2.39**
4. Suppression of Aggression	1	201	N.S.
5. Deification	-14	80	N.S.
6. Comradeship and Sharing	-41	603	1.82*
7. Strictness	10	166	N.S.
8. Breaking the Will	19	137	N.S.
9. Autonomy of Child	-25	335	N.S.
10. Equalitarianism	-25	205	1.81*
11. Fostering Dependency	4	142	N.S.
12. Achievement	1	167	N.S.

N = 12
df = 11
***.01 > 3.106
**.05 > 2.201
*.10 > 1.796

[1] Matched *t* test

These categories represent slightly different areas of diversity from those noted in the Clinics and Control group. There is a greater initial occurrence of heterogeneity in the interpersonal, self-maintenance and control areas. This different pattern might be relevant to the subsequent dropout behavior of these subjects considered in Question 9.

The Clinic Dropout group fathers (Table 466) showed significant variation in: categories 2 - Suppression of Sexuality and 5 - Deification at the .05 level, and 6 - Comradeship and Sharing at the .10 level. No differences at the .01 level were found. These areas of diversity between the PARI and AMR scores are similar in content to those noted on the total group comparison (interpersonal, self maintenance and control) and are essentially different from the content emphasis noted for the other groups.

TABLE 466

COMPARISON BETWEEN PARALLEL CATEGORIES ON THE PARI AND AMR SCORES FOR THE CLINIC DROPOUT GROUP FATHERS[1]

Category	ADMINISTRATION I		
	ΣD	ΣD^2	t
1. Expression of Affection	-14	118	N.S.
2. Suppression of Sex	20	120	3.88**
3. Avoidance of Communication	7	25	N.S.
4. Suppression of Aggression	2	70	N.S.
5. Deification	10	30	3.87**
6. Comradeship and Sharing	30	342	2.40*
7. Strictness	4	104	N.S.
8. Breaking the Will	8	62	N.S.
9. Autonomy of Child	-17	199	N.S.
10. Equalitarianism	-11	63	N.S.
11. Approval of Activity	-7	57	N.S.
12. Fostering Dependency	4	78	N.S.
13. Achievement	-6	58	N.S.

$N = 4$
df = 3
***.01 > 5.841
**.05 > 3.182
*.10 > 2.353

[1] Matched t test

Table 467 presents the results of the analysis for the wives of the Clinic Dropout group. No significant differences at any of the three levels were observed. This, too, represents a departure from the initial pattern noted for the female subjects in the other groups considered.

TABLE 467

COMPARISON BETWEEN PARALLEL CATEGORIES ON THE PARI AND AMR SCORES FOR THE CLINIC DROPOUT GROUP MOTHERS[1]

	ADMINISTRATION I		
Category	ΣD	ΣD^2	t
1. Expression of Affection	-13	249	N.S.
2. Suppression of Sex	9	33	N.S.
3. Encouraging Verbalization	-4	270	N.S.
4. Excluding Outside Influences	8	104	N.S.
5. Avoidance of Communication	16	104	N.S.
6. Suppression of Aggression	3	131	N.S.
7. Deification	-4	50	N.S.
8. Comradeship and Sharing	-11	261	N.S.
9. Strictness	6	62	N.S.
10. Breaking the Will	11	75	N.S.
11. Irritability	11	153	N.S.
12. Autonomy of Child	-8	136	N.S.
13. Equalitarianism	-14	142	N.S.
14. Approval of Activity	5	41	N.S.
15. Fostering Dependency	0	64	N.S.
16. Acceleration of Development	7	87	N.S.
17. Achievement	7	109	N.S.

$N = 8$
df = 7
***.01 > 3.499
**.05 > 2.365
*.10 > 1.895

[1] Matched *t* test

The pattern of initial variation presented by the Clinic Dropout group on the PARI-AMR comparison is different from the relatively consistent pattern observed for the four clinic groups and the Control. This is especially true for categories indicative of self-orientation.

G. Attrition Group

The t-test analysis of the general-specific parallel PARI-AMR categories for the Attrition group (Table 46B) was performed for the total group only, since the small N would have limited the interpretation of the results of the spearate father and mother comparisons. Category 6 - Comradeship and Sharing showed significant differences at the .01 level, while categories 3 - Avoidance of Communication and 5 - Deification reached significance at the .10 level. No differences at the .05 level were noted.

TABLE 46B

COMPARISON BETWEEN PARALLEL CATEGORIES ON PARI AND AMR SCORES FOR THE ATTRITION GROUP[1]

	ADMINISTRATION I		
Category	ΣD	ΣD^2	t
1. Expression of Affection	-8	42	N.S.
2. Suppression of Sex	-3	29	N.S.
3. Avoidance of Communication	-9	25	2.46*
4. Suppression of Aggression	5	51	N.S.
5. Deification	-10	34	2.20*
6. Comradeship and Sharing	-9	15	13.42***
7. Strictness	13	105	N.S.
8. Breaking the Will	8	36	N.S.
9. Autonomy of Child	-6	70	N.S.
10. Equalitarianism	0	28	N.S.
11. Fostering Dependency	-7	43	N.S.
12. Achievement	8	34	N.S.

N = 6
df = 5
***.01 > 4.032
**.05 > 2.571
*.10 > 2.015

[1] Matched t test

These three indices of initial divergence between the two sets of scores are dynamically similar to the divergent category areas obtained on the Clinic Dropout group comparison. A greater emphasis on the self-maintenance and interpersonal aspects is noted at this level in these two groups than those groups comprised of the counseling participants or the Control population. It appears that in general and specific attitudes the Attrition group is somewhat more similar to the Clinic Dropout group than the Experimental and Control populations.

In general, the t-test comparison of the general attitudes measured by the PARI and their specific counterparts relevant to retardation on the AMR yields minimal initial variation. A tendency for diversity between the two to increase after counseling for the two concentrated clinic groups is noted. However, much of the shift proves to be of a temporary nature as original frequency and patterns are essentially reverted to after the post-counseling period. The Twice a Month clinic group displays the best maintenance of counseling influenced variability through the post-test period. The more distributed Once a Month group seems to display neither a shift nor a frequency increase in the contrast of the general and specific categories. The Control group displays an initial pattern similar to that of the four clinic groups and generally shows minor change on the re-test comparison. The Clinic Dropout and Attrition groups display somewhat different patterns from these groups. The emphasis on the more self-oriented items may be related to the dropout behavior. In general the husband sub-group shows less change due to counseling effect than the wives although initial occurrences are somewhat similar.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The importance of studying the attitudes and need personality structure of parents is reflected in the increasing significance attributed to parent-child psychological interrelationships. One major area of investigation in this total scope of parent-child dynamics is the influence of a retarded child upon parents from the middle socio-economic group. Our information concerning this problem is limited and somewhat erroreous. Many of the misconceptions stem from the lack of research and the different personalistic orientations of clinicians toward appraising the dynamics of attitudes and need personality structure of parents. More significantly, the possibility for changing these aspects through counseling has received scant attention. Thus, the objectives of this research project were to accumulate pertinent data relative to both facets, and thereby enhance the goal of familial adjustment.

Specifically, the intent of this investigation was to determine (1) the general and specific attitudes and need personality structure of parents who have educable mentally handicapped children and (2) the influence of selected counseling procedures upon attitudes and need personality structure and the sustained effect over a period of time.

The patterns of need personality and attitude structure of middle socio-economic level parents of educable mentally handicapped children were investigated by a variety of measures: an interview quantified by the utilization of Dollard's Discomfort Relief Quotient schema, The Parental Attitude Research Instrument, The Attitude Scale Toward Mental Retardation, The Gradient Sentence Completion Test and the Stern Activities Index. Middle socio-economic status was determined by The Index of Status Characteristics.

Procedurally, the sample was drawn from five different communities - Binghamton, New York City, Rochester, Schenectady, and Syracuse, New York. Each parent was interviewed initially. Following this, those parents who wished to participate were pre-tested on all measures and then assigned to five different groups. These constituted four different counseling groups - Cazenovia - a week-end, Minnowbrook - one week, Twice-a-Month, and Once-a-Month, and a Control group which was not afforded any opportunity for counseling. Generally, mates were placed in different groups in order to facilitate verbal expression and insights. The six counseling sessions were held constant for each experimental group. At the culmination of the counseling experience for each group, the participants again were administered the complete test battery exclusive of the interview. After a period of from 6-9 months during which no formal contact was maintained, the total battery was readministered to each of the counseling groups, as well as the control group. Due to the dropout behavior of some of the subjects who originally indicated a desire to participate, a number of additional groups (Clinic Dropout, Attrition and Contact) were formed to ascertain pertinent data which might distinguish between those parents who continued in counseling and those who did not.

Statistical analysis was performed by rank scores, the analysis of variance and t-test techniques to ascertain the significance of the data relevant to the variables considered in the study.

Twelve major questions were derived to serve as guidelines for interpreting the data. The questions and the more general summarizations are as follows:

QUESTION 1: WHAT IS THE ATTITUDE STRUCTURE OF PARENTS WHO HAVE EDUCABLE MENTALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN?

The general attitudes of the total group toward the child and child-rearing practices suggested a highly positive pattern of parent-child relationships. The interactive elements of comradeship, equalitarianism, and permitting the child to express himself were highlighted. The negative areas which were ranked lowest were more related to the suppressive measures and the development of an excessive supportive relationship. These findings were consistent for both mothers and fathers. Actually, these patterns were not unexpected. It would appear that having a retarded child does not create negative general attitudes of child-rearing practices of middle socio-economic level parents, at least as measured the PARI.

QUESTION 2: WHAT IS THE PATTERN OF FAMILIAL ADJUSTMENT OF PARENTS OF EDUCABLE MENTALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN?

Adjustment for the entire group, as determined by an interview technique and the D.R.Q. scoring method, showed that greater relief was evident in a reconciliation to the handicap and parental satisfaction with educational and organized activities - goals. Somewhat less familial adjustment was noted in the reaction of the local community members toward the retardate, intrafamilial relationships which concern disciplinary measures, special considerations and the relationship between the retardate and his siblings, and the impact upon the parents' social life as a consequence of the retardation. Although the pattern for mothers and fathers was similar to the combined group, mothers indicated a greater dissatisfaction with the neighborhood contacts. Since mothers are more directly related to the neighborhood, this difference is plausible.

It seems that acceptance of retardation and the ways of coping with it through education are viewed with comparatively less concern than the more personalized areas. Significantly, in each of the cities from which the population emanated, special classes and clinical medical facilities are available. However, neglect of the more personally involved areas of behavior leads to greater discomfort. The interpretation of retardation for personal adjustment to the familial and community relationships is obviously needed to enhance overall adjustment.

QUESTION 3: IS THERE SIGNIFICANT VARIABILITY WITHIN THE TOTAL POPULATION ON ANY OF THE INSTRUMENTS USED?

The problem of initial variability is a critical one in determining the effects of any experimental treatment upon a population. This problem is compounded when a variety of interrelated rather than discrete categories are employed to measure significant differences. Recognizing both these pertinent facts, initial variability was determined for the total population.

Although some variability does exist on the IRQ, AMB, GSC: Direction Scores, and SAI, the population can be considered homogeneous for these measures because the differences are within chance probabilities. However, the GSC. Variable scores exhibited slightly greater than chance variation. The open-endedness of the GSC. may account for this variability. Surprisingly, the PARI scores also showed such lack of homogeneity that any results from the counseling procedure are open to suspicion and should be viewed with caution. There appears to be no apparent explanation for this wide diversity since the population came from the same socio-economic level and comparable educational backgrounds.

QUESTION 4: WHAT IS THE EFFECT OF COUNSELING UPON THE ATTITUDES AND NEED PERSONALITY STRUCTURE OF PARENTS WHO HAVE EDUCABLE MENTALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN?

The counseling treatment brought about significant change in attitudes and need patterns on all the measures used except the SAI. The facets covered by the SAI may be more resistive to change because they involve the more individualized personality factors.

Generally, more frequent and greater change was noted following the counseling on the more specific dynamics relating to retardation and personal adjustment than on the more generalized aspects of child-rearing.

Since the data was analyzed according to the various clinic treatment groups, a sequence of levels of change seemed to be suggestive according to the various lengths of the counseling period. The groups which held their counseling in a shorter span of time generally restricted the areas of immediate change to specific problem areas, whereas those having a more extended counseling period evidenced more change in generalized personal and goal-oriented areas.

The change observed in these experimental groups is in contrast to the lack of significant change noted in the Control group.

In general, no sharp or consistent differences between the two sexes appear for either the various areas or degree of change related to the counseling treatment.

Thus, counseling seems to have a general effect on the alteration of attitudes of parents of educable mentally handicapped children. The trend is toward a liberalization of attitudes toward retardation and personal adjustment. There seems to be a lesser effect due to counseling on areas relating to child-rearing aspects.

QUESTION 5: WHAT IS THE INFLUENCE OF THE LENGTH OF THE COUNSELING PERIOD UPON THE ATTITUDES AND NEED PERSONALITY STRUCTURE OF PARENTS OF THE EDUCABLE MENTALLY HANDICAPPED AT EACH TESTING PERIOD: (a) IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING TERMINATION OF COUNSELING AND (b) AFTER A 6-9 MONTHS TIME INTERVAL?

The length of the counseling period tended to affect both the amount and the type of change in attitudes and need personality patterns of the population. Those groups having a more extended counseling period tended to show a greater immediate shift in the generalized areas than in specific aspects whereas the more concentrated counseling groups tended to exhibit immediate change in more specific areas such as attitudes toward retardation and facets of personal adjustment. Thus the greater change immediately after counseling appeared on the AMR, GSC, and SAI.

After the lapse of the 6-9 months period of time, the change on variables relating to personal adjustment measured by the SAI increased while that on aspects relating specifically to retardation (AMR) and personality variables (SAI) decreased somewhat. Differences related to child-rearing patterns consistently decreased over the total period.

The length of the counseling period seems to differentiate the amount and areas of change immediately after counseling and after a period following counseling. The post-counseling period seems to allow an opportunity for the individual to more totally react to individual information and impressions gained during counseling. This is followed by an integration of some aspects into an individual's total pattern of functioning (SAI). Other aspects of a more specific nature are either integrated so that they become less obvious on the measures used or are apparently more likely to be discarded because they do not readily fit into such a pattern.

QUESTION 6: WHAT IS THE EFFECT OF A "CONCENTRATED" VERSUS A "DISTRIBUTED" COUNSELING PERIOD UPON THE ATTITUDES AND NEED PERSONALITY STRUCTURE OF PARENTS OF EDUCABLE MENTALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN?

When the two major components of the treatment groups were contrasted, there were more differences on the frequency of the personality patterns measured by the GSC and SAI. The more specific patterns toward retardation and child-rearing (AMR and PARI) showed much less differentiation between these two counseling treatment segments.

It is suggested that the variation in the length of time the individuals were affiliated with the counseling group has a greater impact upon generalized patterns which might involve more personal integration than the more specific and isolated aspects.

QUESTION 7: WHAT ARE THE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES IN ATTITUDES AND NEED PERSONALITY STRUCTURE BETWEEN FATHERS AND MOTHERS OF EDUCABLE MENTALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN?

For the most part, the significant variation between the male and female components of the study population was minimal. While there are some indications of inter-sex variation on the various instruments at different phases of the counseling and post-counseling period, they do not seem to be of sufficient magnitude or consistency to be attributed to a generalized differential reaction to the counseling experience.

Both initial and subsequent (after counseling) variation between the two sexes were generally greater on the general child-rearing aspects (PARI) and those items relating to personal adjustment (GSC and SAI) than for specific references to retardation (AMR).

QUESTION 8: WHAT DIFFERENCES IN ATTITUDES AND NEED PERSONALITY STRUCTURE EXIST BETWEEN THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS AND THE CONTROL GROUP?

Significant differences between the two population segments occurred both prior to and following the counseling treatment given the experimental groups. An increase in this divergence appeared on the scales related to child-rearing practices and some personality patterns (PARI and SAI). Attitudes relating to retardation (AMR) and the more personalized need areas (GSC) did not show an increase in divergence between the treatment and non-treatment groups, although there were trends in some areas.

QUESTION 9: WHAT DIFFERENCES EXIST IN ATTITUDES AND NEED PERSONALITY STRUCTURE BETWEEN PARENTS IN A GROUP WHO COMPLETE COUNSELING AND THOSE WHO DROP OUT IN TWO OR LESS COUNSELING PERIODS (EXPERIMENTAL VERSUS CLINIC DROPOUT)?

A comparison of the initial instrument scores of the small segment which did not complete counseling was made with the scores for the total clinic group which completed the counseling sessions. Since only Test I data was available, the comparison was only able to delve into initial differences which might account for the dropout behavior.

There was an incidence of differences on topics related to ascendancy, dominance and control on the measures related to child-rearing (PARI) and the personality need variables (GSC).

It should also be noted that in a number of the instances of dropout of the participants very real reasons of the personal or family situation were factors influencing the inability to continue the counseling sessions.

QUESTION 10: WHAT DIFFERENCES EXIST IN ATTITUDES AND NEED PERSONALITY STRUCTURE BETWEEN PARENTS WHO TAKE AN INITIAL TEST BUT DO NOT ENTER COUNSELING (ATTRITION) AND THOSE WHO CONTINUE IN COUNSELING (EXPERIMENTAL)?

The comparison of initial scores for these two groups showed a pattern similar to that noted in the preceding contrast of the Clinic Dropout and the Combined Clinic group. Major divergence was apparent on the GSC need personality variables. The initial testing period may have influenced these individuals with a generally higher need score to avoid participation in the counseling sessions.

QUESTION 11: WHAT DIFFERENCES EXIST IN ATTITUDES AND NEED PERSONALITY STRUCTURE BETWEEN A GROUP WHO ARE INTERVIEWED BUT DO NOT ENTER COUNSELING (CONTACT) AND THOSE WHO CONSUMMATE THEIR COUNSELING SESSIONS (EXPERIMENTAL)?

On the comparison of the only data available for the Contact group, DRQ . scores acquired through the interview analysis, the Contact group seemed to have greater concerns in the area of achievement. The Combined Clinic group showed higher need in the areas concerned with interpersonal relationships.

This is a dynamic pattern similar to that shown in questions 9 and 10 with comparisons of the Clinic Dropout and the Attrition groups.

QUESTION 12: WHAT DIFFERENCES EXIST IN PARENTS OF EDUCABLE MENTALLY HANDICAPPED CHILDREN BETWEEN GENERAL ATTITUDES TOWARD CHILD-REARING PRACTICES AND SPECIFIC ATTITUDES RELEVANT TO RETARDATION?

The contrast of the general attitudes toward child-rearing practices as measured by the PARI and attitudes toward retardation as measured by the AMR showed minimal initial variation. In general, the diversity increased after the counseling with some return to the initial patterns and frequency of occurrence after the post-counseling period.

Areas displaying divergence were essentially those related to control of children's behavior and the achievement areas. In general, more flexibility and independence was expressed toward children in general on the PARI than on the parallel items specific to retardation on the AMR.

The major hypothesis to be tested was that counseling over a short or extended time span will affect the attitudes and need personality structure of parents of educable mentally handicapped children. Although the resultant specific patterns were not consistent, significant changes seemed to occur which are greater than might be attributable to chance. It might be safely concluded that counseling has a selected effect upon the attitudes and need personality structure of the parents included in this study. To expand this conclusion any further is unwarranted because of the limitations in the study and the selective factor of the population.

The extension of the findings for practical implementation is somewhat restricted. Undoubtedly, group counseling of an intensive but limited extent of time can be selectively beneficial. The savings in time, money, and effort for the enhancement of familial adjustment are immediately apparent. Furthermore, if the community is concerned with making the educable mentally handicapped child a contributing member of society, group counseling for parents is an important adjunct in reaching this goal.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Abbe, Alice E. "Maternal Attitudes Toward Child Behavior and Their Relationship to the Diagnostic Category of the Child," Journal of Genetic Psychology, XCII(1958), 167-173.

2. Allport, Gordon W. "Attitudes," A Handbook of Social Psychology, edited by C. Marchison. Worcester, Massachusetts: Clark University Press, 1935.

3. Baldwin, Alfred L.; Kalhorn, Joan; and Breese, Fay H. "The Appraisal of Parental Behavior," Psychological Monographs, LXIII(1949), 1-85.

4. Begab, Michael J. "Factors in Counseling Parents of Retarded Children," American Journal of Mental Deficiency, LX(1956), 515-525.

5. Bell, Richard Q. "Retrospective Studies of Parent-Child Relations," Child Development, XXIX(1958), 323-39.

6. Bell, Richard Q. "Maternal Types Identifiable Through Attitude Measures," American Psychologist, XII(1957), 398-399.

7. Bell, Richard Q. Informal Notes on the Use of the PARI. Bethesda: National Institutes of Health. 1958 (Mineograph).

8. Block, Jack. "Personality Characteristics Associated With Fathers' Attitudes Toward Child-Rearing," Child Development, XXVI(1955), 41-48.

9. Blodgett, Harriet E. "Counseling Parents of Mentally Retarded Children," Minnesota Medicine, XL(1957), 721-22; 730.

10. Boles, Glen. "Personality Factors in Mothers of Cerebral Palsied Children," Genetic Psychology Monographs, LIX(1959), 159-218.

11. Bray, Douglas W. "The Prediction of Behavior From Two Attitude Scales," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLV(1950), 64-84.

12. Brody, S. *Patterns of Mothering*, New York: International Universities Press, 1956.

13. Burgess, Caroline B. "Counseling Parents of Children With Handicaps," *New Outlook for the Blind*, XLIX(1955), 1-5.

14. Cantril, H. "Generalized and Specific Attitudes," *Psychological Monographs*, XLII(1932), 192.

15. Cattell, Raymond B. *The Description and Measurement of Personality*. New York: World Book Company, 1946.

16. Coleman, James C. "Group Therapy with Parents of Mentally Deficient Children," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LVII(1953), 700-704.

17. Coughlin, Ellen W. "Parental Attitudes Toward Handicapped Children," *Child*, II(1947), 2.

18. Dahl, Vivian W. *The Social Competence of Blind Children in Relation to Mother's Attitude on Fostering Dependency*. San Francisco: 1958. (Mimeograph).

19. Dollard, John and Mowrer, O. Hobart. "A Method of Measuring Tension in Written Documents," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, XLII(1947), 1-32.

20. Doob, L. W. *Public Opinion and Propaganda*. New York: Henry Holt, 1948.

21. Edwards, Allen L. *Experimental Design in Psychological Research*. New York: Rinehart and Co., 1950.

22. English, Horace B. and English, Ava Champney. *A Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psychoanalytical Terms*. New York: Longmans Green and Company, 1958.

23. Fredericks, Marilee U. "A Comparative Study of Expressed Parent Attitudes: Mothers of Mentally Retarded and Orthopedically Handicapped vs. Mothers of Non-handicapped Children," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Oregon, 1957.

24. Gallagher, James J. "Rejecting Parents?" *Exceptional Children*, XXII(1956), 273-276; 294.

25. Gordon, Edmund W. and Ullman, Montague. "Reactions of Parents to Problems of Mental Retardation in Children," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LXI(1956), 158-163.

26. Graliker, Betty V.; Parmalee, Arthur H.; and Koch, Richard. "Attitude Study of Parents of Mentally Retarded Children," *Pediatrics*, XXIV(1959), 819-821.

27. Grebler, Anne M. "Parental Attitudes Toward Mentally Retarded Children," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LVI(1952), 475-484.

28. Green, Bert F. "Attitude Measurement," *Handbook of Social Psychology*. Edited by Gardner Lindsey. Cambridge, Massachusetts; Addison-Wesley, 1954, Vol. 1, pp. 335-369.

29. Greenberg, Harold A. "Problems of Parents of Handicapped Children," *Exceptional Children*, XVII(1950), 1-7; 23-24.

30. Guttman, L. "The Problem of Attitude and Opinion Measurement." In S.A. Stouffer, et al., *Measurement and Prediction*. Princeton University Press, 1950, pp. 46-59.

31. Haring, Norris G.; Stern, George G.; and Cruickshank, William M. *Attitudes of Educators Toward Exceptional Children*. Syracuse; Syracuse University Press, 1958.

32. Hartshorne, H. and May, M. Studies in the Nature of Character; *Studies in Deceit*. New York: Macmillan, 1928.

33. Heilman, Ann E. "Parental Adjustment to the Dull Handicapped Child," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LIV(1950), 556-562.

34. Jensen, Reynold A. "The Clinical Management of the Mentally Retarded Child and the Parents," *American Journal of Psychiatry*, CVI(1950), 830-833.

35. Kanner, Leo. "Parents' Feelings About Retarded Children," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LVII(1953), 375-83.

36. Kelman, Howard R. "Parent Guidance in a Clinic for Mentally Retarded Children," *Social Casework*, XXXIV(1953), 441-447.

37. Kelman, Howard R. "Some Problems in Casework with Parents of Mentally Retarded Children," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LXI(1957), 595-598.

38. Klebanoff, L. B. Attitudes of Mothers of Schizophrenic, Brain Injured and Retarded, and Normal Children. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Boston University, 1957.

39. Krech, David and Crutchfield, Richard. *Theory and Problems of Social Psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1948.

40. Laws, Gertrude. "Parent-Child Relationships: A Study of the Attitudes and Practices of Parents Concerning Social Adjustment in Childhood," *Contributions to Education*, No. 283. New York: Teachers College, 1927.

41. Mann, Vera D. "A Study of the Attitudes of Mothers of Cerebral Palsied Children Toward Child Adjustment," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, American University, 1957.

42. Mark, Joseph C. "The Attitudes of the Mothers of Male Schizophrenics Toward Child Behavior," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, XLVIII(1953), 185-189.

43. McNeman, Quinn. *Psychological Statistics*. John Wiley and Sons, 1955.

44. Merrill, Barbara. "A Measurement of Mother-Child Interaction," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, XLI(1946), 37-49.

45. Morris, Elise F. "Casework Training Needs for Counselling Parents of the Retarded," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LIX(1955), 510-516.

46. Murray, Henry A. *Explorations in Personality*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.

47. Murray, Mrs. Max A. "Needs of Parents of Mentally Retarded Children," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LXIII(1959), 1078-1089.

48. Nelson, Martha Beatrice. *The Parental Attitudes Expressed by Mothers of Exceptional Children*. Reprint. Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University, 1958. (Mimeograph).

49. Ohlsen, Merele M.; Proff, Fred C.; and Roeber, Edward C. "Counseling and Adjustment," *Review of Educational Research*, XXVI(1956), 292-307.

50. Popp, Cleo E.; Ingram, Vivien; and Jordan, Paul H. "Helping Parents Understand Their Mentally Handicapped Child," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LXIII(1954), 530-534.

51. Rankin, Joseph E. "A Group Therapy Experiment with Mothers of Mentally Deficient Children," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LXII(1957), 49-56.

52. Remmers, H. H. *Introduction to Opinion and Attitude Measurement*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954.

53. Richards, Margaret. "The Retarded Child in a State School and the Problems He Presents From a Parent's Viewpoint," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LVIII(1953), 56-59.

54. Rogers, Carl R. and Dymond, Rosalind F. *Psychotherapy and Personality Change*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.

55. Rohde, Amanda R. "Explorations in Personality by the Sentence Completion Method," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, XXX(1946), 169-81.

56. Rohde, Amanda R. *The Sentence Completion Method; Its Diagnostic and Clinical Application to Mental Disorders*. New York: Ronald Press Company, 1957.

57. Rosen, Leonard. "Selected Aspects in the Development of the Mother's Understanding of Her Mentally Retarded Child," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LXIX(1955), 522-528.

58. Rosenzweig, Saul. "Investigating and Appraising Personality." *Methods of Psychology*. Edited by T. G. Andrews. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1948. Chapter 18.

59. Rotter, Julian B., and Willerman, Benjamin. "The Incomplete Sentences Test as a Method of Studying Personality." *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, XI(1947), 43-48.

60. Sacks, Joseph M. "The Relative Effect Upon Projective Responses of Stimuli Referring to the Subject and of Stimuli Referring to Other Persons," *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, XIII(1949), 12-21.

61. Schaefer, Earl S. and Bell, Richard Q. *An Adaptation of the Parental Attitude Research Instrument for Fathers*. Bethesda: National Institutes of Health, 1957. Mimeographed.

62. Schaefer, Earl S. and Bell, Richard Q. "Development of a Parental Attitude Research Instrument," *Child Development*, XXIX(1958), 339-361.

63. Schaefer, Earl S. and Bell, Richard Q. *Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI)*. Unpublished manuscript, Laboratory of Psychology, National Institutes of Health, 1955. Mimeographed.

64. Schaefer, Earl S. and Bell, Richard Q. "Patterns of Attitudes Toward Child Rearing and the Family," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, LIV(1957), 391-395.

65. Schaefer, Earl S.; Bell, Richard Q.; and Bayley, Nancy. *Development of a Maternal Behavior Research Instrument*. Bethesda, Maryland: National Institute of Mental Health, National Institutes of Health, Public Health Service, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1957. Mimeographed.

66. Schaefer, Earl, S.; Bell, Richard Q.; and Bayley, Nancy. *Quantification of Maternal Behavior and Consistency of Mother-Child Interaction*. Bethesda: National Institutes of Health, 1958. Mimeographed.

67. Sheimo, S. L. "Problems in Helping Parents of Mentally Defective and Handicapped Children," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LVI(1951), [illegible]-47.

68. Shoben, Edward J., Jr. "The Assessment of Parental Attitudes in Relation to Child Adjustment," *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, XXXIX(1949), 101-148.

69. Smith, Mahlon Brewster; Bruner, Jerome S.; White, Robert W. *Opinions and Personality*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1956.

70. Stein, Morris I. "The Use of a Sentence Completion Test for the Diagnosis of Personality." *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, III(1947), 47-56.

71. Stern, George G. *Preliminary Manual: Activities Index*. Syracuse, New York: Psychological Research Center, May 1958.

72. Stogdill, Ralph M. "Attitudes of Parents, Students and Mental Hygienists Toward Children's Behavior." *Journal of Social Psychology*, IV(1933), 486-489.

73. Stone, Marguerite M. "Parental Attitudes to Retardation," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LIII(1948), 363-372.

74. Symonds, Percival M. *The Psychology of Parent-Child Relationships*. New York: Appleton-Century Company, 1939.

75. Symonds, Percival M. "The Sentence Completion Test as a Projective Technique," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, XLII(1947), 320-329.

76. Tendler, A. "A Preliminary Report on a Test for Emotional Insight," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, XIV(1930), 122-136.

77. Thurston, John R. "A Procedure for Evaluating Parental Attitudes Toward the Handicapped," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LXIV(1959), 148-155.

78. Thurston, John R. "Counseling the Parents of the Severely Handicapped," *Exceptional Children*, XXVI(1960), 351-352.

79. Thurstone, Louis L. and Chave, E. *The Measurement of Attitude*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.

80. Thurstone, Louis L. "The Measurement of Social Attitudes," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, XXVI(1931), 249-269.

81. Thurstone, Louis L. "Theory of Attitude Measurement," *Psychological Bulletin*, XXXVI(1929), 222-241.

82. Warner, W. Lloyd; Meeker, Marchia; and Eells, Kenneth. *Social Class in America*. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1949.

83. Weingold, Joseph T. and Hormuth, Rudolph P. "Group Guidance of Parents of Mentally Retarded Children," *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, IX(1953), 118-124.

84. Winder, Alvin E. "A Program of Group Counseling for the Parents of Cerebral Palsied Children," *Cerebral Palsy Review*, XIX(1958), 10-12.

85. Zuckerman, Marvin and Ribback, Beatrice Barrett. "Normative Data and Factor Analysis on the Parental Attitude Research Instrument," *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, XXII(1958), 165-168.

86. Zuckerman, Marvin; Oltean, Mary; and Monashkin, Irwin. "The Parental Attitudes of Mothers of Schizophrenics," *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, XXII(1958), 307-310.

87. Zuckerman, Marvin; Barrett, Beatrice; and Bragiel, Raymond. *Parental Attitudes of Parents of Child Guidance Patients*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Medical Center. 1958. Mimeographed.

88. Zuckerman, Marvin and Oltean, Mary. "Some Relationships Between Maternal Attitude Factors and Authoritarianism, Personality Needs, Psychopathology, and Self-acceptance," *Child Development*, XXX(1959), 27-36.

89. Zuk, G. H. "The Religious Factor and the Role of Guilt in Parental Acceptance of the Retarded Child," *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, LXIV(1959), 139-147.